

Richard Jude Thompson

Terror of the Radiance

Aššur Covenant to YHWH Covenant

Academic Press Fribourg
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
Main Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2013

Terror of the Radiance: Aššur Covenant to Yhwh Covenant

Thompson, Richard Jude

Abstract: This study investigates Martin Noth's conclusion about the Deuteronomistic History (DH) that the people of Israel had committed apostasy (Abfall), ceased to obey the law code of Yhwh, and thus lost their land. Scholars have challenged Noth's hypothesis and even the existence of such a history. The present study adopts a thematic reading of the DH as a coherent corpus of writing with a consistent message. A close reading reveals a god, Yhwh, who declares war on other gods ('ēlōhîm 'āḥērîm) and commands his followers to conquer and to sanctify the mountain of the Emorites (har hā'ēmōrî; Deut 1:7) and the land of Canaan ('ereṣ kəna an; Deut 32:49) to Yhwh. The sanctification includes the killing of the people living there: "When you attack them, you shall annihilate (haḥārēm taḥārîm) them entirely. Do not make a treaty with them and do not show mercy to them" (Deut 7:1–2). Throughout the DH, Yhwh and his spokespersons, the nəbî'im, reward obedience and punish disobedience. Because the disobedient people of Israel fail to enforce Yhwh's command to remove the nations of Canaan and their 'ēlōhîm 'āḥērîm, Yhwh enforces imperial law and sentences them to national death and exile. This study thus hypothesizes that the DH depicts an imperial, military covenant. After a survey of the inscriptions of the second-millennium b.c.e. Levant, the Hittite empire, the Neo-Assyrian empire, and the first-millennium b.c.e. Levant, the study concludes with a hypothesis that the evidence points to the ideology of the Neo-Assyrian empire as the historical precedent for the Dtr covenant. The study challenges two presuppositions that underlie both the DH and its scholarship: that of the tōrāh as law and that of Yhwh as a unique god.

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-135441>

Published Version

Originally published at:

Thompson, Richard Jude (2013). Terror of the Radiance: Aššur Covenant to Yhwh Covenant. Fribourg / Göttingen: Academic Press / Vandenhoeck Ruprecht.

Thompson Terror of the Radiance

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Published on behalf of the BIBLE+ORIENT Foundation

in co-operation with

the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg (Switzerland),
the Egyptological Institute, University of Basel,
the Institute of Archaeology, Near Eastern Section, University of Berne,
the Institute of Biblical Research, University of Lausanne,
the Department of Religious Studies, University of Zurich,
and the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies

by

Susanne Bickel, Othmar Keel, Thomas C. Römer, Daniel Schwemer
and Christoph Uehlinger

Author

Richard Jude Thompson (b. 1951) comes from Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. At Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, he finished the A.L.B. (1991) in religion with a thesis about the Gospel of Thomas logion 27; the A.L.M. (1993) in Hebrew Bible with a thesis about the sapiential works (4Q416–4Q418) among the Dead Sea scrolls; and the Ph.D. (2011) in Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations with a dissertation about the deuteronomistic covenant and Neo-Assyrian imperial ideology, of which this book is a revised version. At present he teaches biblical Hebrew and Aramaic online with eTeacherGroup.com in affiliation with The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and holds an adjunct teaching position in the History and Anthropology departments of Idaho State University.

Richard Jude Thompson

Terror of the Radiance

Aššur Covenant to YHWH Covenant

Academic Press Fribourg
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen

Internet general catalogue:
Academic Press Fribourg: www.paulusedition.ch
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen: www.v-r.de

Camera-ready text prepared by the author.

© 2013 by Academic Press Fribourg, Fribourg Switzerland
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen

ISBN: 978-3-7278-1737-3 (Academic Press Fribourg)
ISBN: 978-3-525-54381-8 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)
ISSN: 1015-1850 (Orb. biblicus orient.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	VIII
ABBREVIATIONS	IX
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: PROBLEMS WITH NOTH'S HYPOTHESIS	2
1.1. <i>Noth's Deuteronomistic History</i>	2
1.2. <i>Scholarship since Noth</i>	4
1.3. <i>Conclusion</i>	22
CHAPTER 2: DEUTERONOMISTIC COVENANT: A NEW HYPOTHESIS	24
2.1. <i>A Declaration of War</i>	24
2.1.1. Scholarship	31
2.2. <i>Obedience</i>	31
2.2.1. Scholarship	36
2.3. <i>Capital Punishment and Law Enforcement</i>	40
2.3.1. Scholarship	41
2.4. <i>Hypotheses</i>	42
2.4.1. Elements of the Dtr Covenant	42
2.4.2. Presuppositions of the DH	42
2.4.3. Law	42
2.4.4. <i>Nəbî'îm</i>	44
2.4.5. Chronology and Context	45
2.4.6. Universal Omnipotent God	46
2.5. <i>Plan of the Present Work</i>	46
CHAPTER 3: DEUTERONOMISTIC COVENANT AND THE LEVANT	48
3.1. <i>Survey of the Scholarship</i>	48
3.2. <i>Myths and Legends of Ugarit</i>	51
3.2.1. Kirta	51
3.2.2. Aqhat	53
3.2.3. Ba'lu and 'Anatu	54
3.3. <i>Role of Myth in Ugaritic Society</i>	56
3.4. <i>Triadic Family Matrix</i>	58
3.5. <i>Dyadic Master-Servant Political Hierarchy</i>	59
3.6. <i>Patriarchalism and the Patrimonial Household Model</i>	60
3.7. <i>Weber</i>	63
3.8. <i>Paradigms: (1) 'ummatu, bêt šaphî and (2) bît ardi / arad ardi</i>	65
3.9. <i>Levantine Defensive and Cooperative Warfare</i>	65
3.10. <i>Treaties of Trade, Mutual Defense, and Return of Fugitives</i>	69
3.11. <i>Levantine Trade Treaties vs. Imperial DH Covenant</i>	72

3.12. <i>Hypotheses</i>	73
CHAPTER 4: DEUTERONOMISTIC COVENANT AND HITTITE TREATIES	75
4.1. <i>Survey of the Scholarship</i>	75
4.2. <i>Religion of Ḫattuša</i>	77
4.3. <i>Imperial Warfare of Ḫattuša</i>	86
4.4. <i>Subjugation Treaties of Ḫattuša</i>	94
4.5. <i>Treaty Theory of Ḫattuša</i>	106
4.6. <i>Ḫattuša and the DH Covenant</i>	108
CHAPTER 5: NEO-ASSYRIAN IMPERIAL IDEOLOGY	113
5.1. <i>Survey of the Scholarship</i>	113
5.2. <i>Aššurnasirpal II (883–859 B.C.E.)</i>	116
5.3. <i>Šalmaneser III (858–823 B.C.E.)</i>	122
5.6. <i>Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 B.C.E.)</i>	127
5.7. <i>Sargon II (721–705 B.C.E.)</i>	134
5.7. <i>Sennacherib (704–681 B.C.E.)</i>	137
5.7. <i>Esarhaddon (680–669 B.C.E.)</i>	141
5.8. <i>Aššurbanipal (669–627 B.C.E.)</i>	146
5.9. <i>Neo-Assyrian Imperial Ideology: Hypotheses</i>	151
CHAPTER 6: NEO-ASSYRIAN EMPIRE AND THE LEVANT	155
6.1. <i>Tell Fakhariyah Inscription</i>	155
6.2. <i>Inscription of Meša' of Moab</i>	159
6.3. <i>Inscription of Kilamuwa of Zinjirli</i>	164
6.4. <i>Inscription of Zakkur of Ḫamat</i>	167
6.5. <i>Inscription of Panammuwa I of Ya'udi for the Hadad Statue</i>	170
6.6. <i>Inscriptions of Mati'el of 'Arpad and Barga'yah of Ktk (Sefire)</i>	172
6.7. <i>Inscription of Azatiwada of Karatepe</i>	177
6.8. <i>Barrākib of Sam'al: Inscription to Panammuwa II</i>	181
6.9. <i>Building Inscription of Barrākib of Sam'al</i>	184
6.10. <i>Reactions to the Empire: Hypotheses</i>	186
CHAPTER 7: AŠŠUR COVENANT TO YHWH COVENANT	189
7.1. <i>Survey of the Scholarship</i>	189
7.1.1. <i>Archaeology</i>	189
7.1.2. <i>History</i>	193
7.1.3. <i>Literature</i>	196
7.2. <i>Neo-Assyrian Inscriptions and the Deuteronomistic Covenant</i>	215
7.2.1. <i>Declaration of War: Conquest</i>	216
7.2.2. <i>Obedience</i>	218
7.2.3. <i>Enforcement and Punishment</i>	220
7.2.4. <i>Imperial Military God with Universal Jurisdiction</i>	223
7.2.5. <i>Terror of the Radiance</i>	227

TABLE OF CONTENTS	VII
<i>7.3. Summary and Hypotheses</i>	229
BIBLIOGRAPHY	235
INDEX	254

PREFACE

The author wishes to acknowledge the contributions of the following individuals without whom the present study could not have succeeded.

The editorial board of *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis*—Prof. Dr. Susanne Bickel, Prof. Dr. Othmar Keel, Prof. Dr. Thomas C. Römer, Prof. Dr. Dr. Bernd U. Schipper, Prof. Dr. Daniel Schwemer, and Prof. Dr. Christoph Uehlinger—brought the perspectives of European scholarship to the work.

The following advisors and readers—Prof. Dr. Jo Ann Hackett, The University of Texas at Austin and Professor Emerita, Harvard University; Prof. Dr. Thomas Römer, Université de Lausanne and Collège de France; Prof. Dr. Prods Oktor Skjaervo, Harvard University, *ex officio*; Dr. Benjamin John Studevent-Hickman, Harvard University—lent their expertise and authority to the work. The thesis, evidence, logic, hypotheses, and errata presented here, however, belong to and remain the sole responsibility of the author.

The faculty, staff, and students of the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, kept the author informed of the relevant issues by means of courses, workshops, seminars, and conversations.

The following representatives of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University—Dr. Gordon Harvey, Lisa Simpson, and Ellen Fox—helped with thesis organization, financing, and moral support in that order.

The staff of Andover-Harvard Theological Library, Widener Library, and Tozzer Library provided support and information for papers, exams, and the dissertation.

The editorial staff of the *Harvard Theological Review* / Harvard Theological Studies—Prof. Dr. François Bovon and Dr. Margaret Studier—supported the author with employment, friendship, and copyediting experience.

The author's spouse, Dawn Kristina Kimbrel, maintained a calm and aesthetic presence throughout the event of the Ph.D.

The author's son, Lazarus Valentine Morrison, honored his father with many a time-out game of catch and a lunch break on the Boston Common.

Richard Jude Thompson
October 2012
Cambridge, Massachusetts

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ANET</i>	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.</i> Edited by J. B. Pritchard.
<i>COS</i>	<i>The Context of Scripture.</i> Edited by William W. Hallo.
<i>CTH</i>	<i>Catalogue des Textes Hittites.</i> Edited by Emmanuel Laroche.
<i>EA</i>	<i>Tell El-Amarna Tablets, 359–379.</i> Anson F. Rainey.
<i>HALOT</i>	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.</i> Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner. Translated by M. E. J. Richardson.
<i>KAI</i>	<i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften.</i> H. Donner and W. Röllig.
<i>Kbo</i>	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi</i>
<i>KUB</i>	<i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi</i>
<i>RIMA</i>	<i>The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods.</i> Edited by Albert Kirk Grayson.
<i>RS</i>	Ras Shamra
<i>SAA</i>	State Archives of Assyria

1.12. Denn, die Gesamtheit der Tatsachen bestimmt, was der Fall ist und auch, was alles nicht der Fall ist.

Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889–1951)
Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung

INTRODUCTION

This study investigates Martin Noth's conclusion about the Deuteronomistic History (DH) that the people of Israel had committed apostasy (*Abfall*), ceased to obey the law code of YHWH, and thus lost their land. Scholars have challenged Noth's hypothesis and even the existence of such a history. The present study adopts a thematic reading of the DH as a coherent corpus of writing with a consistent message. A close reading reveals a god, YHWH, who declares war on other gods (*'ēlōhîm 'ăḥērîm*) and commands his followers to conquer and to sanctify the mountain of the Emorites (*har hā'ēmōrî*; Deut 1:7) and the land of Canaan (*'ereṣ kəna'an*; Deut 32:49) to YHWH. The sanctification includes the killing of the people living there: "When you attack them, you shall annihilate (*haḥārēm taḥārîm*) them entirely. Do not make a treaty with them and do not show mercy to them" (Deut 7:1–2). Throughout the DH, YHWH and his spokespersons, the *nəbî'im*, reward obedience and punish disobedience. Because the disobedient people of Israel fail to enforce YHWH's command to remove the nations of Canaan and their *'ēlōhîm 'ăḥērîm*, YHWH enforces imperial law and sentences them to national death and exile.

This study thus hypothesizes that the DH depicts an imperial, military covenant. After a survey of the inscriptions of the second-millennium B.C.E. Levant, the Hittite empire, the Neo-Assyrian empire, and the first-millennium B.C.E. Levant, the study concludes with a hypothesis that the evidence points to the ideology of the Neo-Assyrian empire as the historical precedent for the Dtr covenant. The study challenges two presuppositions that underlie both the DH and its scholarship: that of the *tôrāh* as law and that of YHWH as a unique god.

CHAPTER 1: PROBLEMS WITH NOTH'S HYPOTHESIS

This chapter will survey the main historical-critical and literary analyses of the Deuteronomistic History (DH) from Martin Noth on to see how scholars have dealt with his hypothesis. They have raised complex issues concerning the composition, dating, and purpose of the DH. At the end of the survey, the present study will introduce some presuppositions at work in the DH that scholarship has so far overlooked. In examining these presuppositions from a wider perspective in the following chapters, this study will then posit some new hypotheses to the main questions of scholarship.

1.1. *Noth's Deuteronomistic History*

The hypothesis of the DH originated with the first chapter of Martin Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, "Das deuteronomistische Werk (Dtr)," in 1943.¹ Noth asserted that this collection of books from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings constituted a unified history of Israel written by a single, exilic author and compiler, whom he called "eines 'deuteronomistischen' Autoren ... mit dem Siglum Dtr."² Dtr used characteristic language and ideology within a common structure and chronology according to four major periods: Moses, Joshua, Judges, and Samuel/Kings. Dtr's theological view of the DH meant that YHWH controlled the fate of the nation according to the commands of the *nəbî'im*.³ Dtr formulated speeches for the main characters at key junctures of the periods in his composition: Joshua 1 and 23, 1 Samuel 12, 1 Kings 8. Deuteronomistic compositions in narrative form include Joshua 12; Judg 2:11–22; and 2 Kgs 17:7–18, 20–23. Dtr included an old law code (Deut 4:44–30:20) within a new framework (Deut 1–4 and 31:1–13) in the form of a speech of Moses. Deuteronomy marked the beginning of the DH and the beginning of the rule of the *nəbî'im*.

Noth dated the DH to around 562 B.C.E. after the date of the last recorded event—Jehoiachin's release from a Babylonian prison—in the Babylonian exile. According to Noth, Dtr wrote to explain to the readers that they suffered in exile after the destruction of their state because of their lack of loyalty to YHWH and their lack of obedience to the old deuteronomic law. A section of Solomon's prayer (1 Kgs 8:46–53) expresses the finality of the punishment and the plea for forgiveness:

û-nətat-tām lipnê 'ôyēb wə-šābûm šəbê-hem 'el-'ereš hā-'ôyēb ...
wə-šābû ... wə-sālaḥtā lə-'am-məkā 'ăšer ḥāṭə'û-ləkā
Should you give them to the enemy, and they are carried away cap-

¹ Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*.

² Ibid., 3–4.

³ Idem, *Deuteronomistic History*, 161.

tive to the land of the enemy ... but they return ... then forgive your people, who offended you! (1 Kgs 8:46, 47, 50)

According to Noth, Dtr focused on the central theological meaning of the history of the people of Israel from the occupation of the land of Canaan to the destruction and exile. Thus Dtr wrote to address the growing disloyalty with warnings, punishment, and ultimate annihilation at the hands of YHWH. Dtr perceived a just retribution in the history of the people and made it the unifying factor and theological conviction of the DH. The people of YHWH had begun with a special role to follow the Deuteronomic law, which enjoined them not to forsake YHWH and to maintain "die ausschliessliche Bindung an den einen Gott ... und singuläre Exklusivität." Dtr presupposed a "theologische Grundvoraussetzungen ... die spezielle Bindung zwischen Gott und Volk ... als 'Bund' ... die durch das 'Gesetz' bestimmte dauernde Regelung der Beziehung zwischen Gott und Volk." Dtr equated covenant and law and promulgated the Deuteronomic law as confirmation of the covenant relationship that began in history with the theophany on the mountain of Horeb. The conquest of the land of Canaan had succeeded because YHWH had accompanied the *nābî* Moses and his successor Joshua.⁴

Within the land of Canaan after the conquest, however, the people of YHWH suffered for their lack of loyalty to YHWH and lack of observance of the law. Dtr's intention appeared centered on the theme of centralized cultic law and the need to prevent illegitimate cults, but at the same time, Dtr disregarded cult sacrifice.⁵ Noth follows the rhetoric of Dtr that the people of YHWH have won the war with the Canaanites and the other nations but have lapsed into *Abfall* (apostasy) and *Verfall* (decay). The destruction of the people of YHWH as punishment for their apostasy and decay had occurred by the time of Dtr's writing, and Dtr explained this destruction as a fulfillment of divine judgment. Yet Noth left open the question about the nature of the apostasy and decay because he followed Dtr's rhetoric that it involved the issue of illegitimate cults alone. The presence of the illegitimate cults would suggest rather that the Canaanites and the others had not yet disappeared from the land.

Dtr introduces the theme of apostasy and decay at the beginning of the book of "Judges." The disloyalty reaches a climax with the people's demand for a king (1 Sam 8:4), and Dtr develops the theme of accelerating decline to the bitter end. Dtr maintains the view that the people were ignoring the deuteronomic law that traced back to Moses at Mount Horeb in order to worship the local Canaanite gods.⁶ The finding of the so-called deuteronomic *tôrât mōšeh* in the temple during the reign of Josiah, however, stopped the decay

⁴ Ibid., 134–35; idem, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 100–101.

⁵ Idem, *Deuteronomic History*, 136–40.

⁶ Ibid., 125–26.

for a moment in the history and introduced a note of hope for the relationship between YHWH and the people. Josiah had accomplished the centralization of the cult and the realization of the pristine, ancient relationship between YHWH and the people. Josiah's reign and activities formed the basis for Dtr's consideration of the history of the nation in relation to this law. Yet Dtr did not put this consideration into writing until after the destruction and exile of the nation. According to Noth, a single creative, literary, and erudite author, Dtr, wrote to explain the failure of the nation as a result of its failure to follow the deuteronomistic law code.

1.2. *Scholarship since Noth*

In the decades since Noth's thesis, the problems with the DH authorship have become more complicated. Focusing on the books of Kings, Alfred Jepsen (1956) proposed two sources and three redaction strata.⁷ The first source, which covered the story from David to Hezekiah (1 Kgs 2:10–2 Kgs 18:1), followed the pattern of a synchronistic chronicle (S) without theological reflection. The second source overlapped the first and covered the period from Solomon to Hezekiah (1 Kgs 5:27–2 Kgs 18:14–16) but had an interest in the cult and followed the pattern of an annals work (A). Both of these sources had a later priestly redactor (R^I) around 580 B.C.E. The priestly redactor considered David the model king and blamed the fall of David's house on Jeroboam's sin of Samaria and Israel but also condemned the southern kingdom for its *bāmôt* cult sites. The *nebiistischen* (*nabî'im*) redactor (R^{II}) added the oral *nabî'im* traditions of the premonarchic period and the conquest and introduced four deuteronomistic themes: election, law of YHWH, apostasy to 'ēlōhîm 'āhērîm, and the *nebiistic* court. This redactor, R^{II}, representing the *nabî'im*, called for the rejection of foreign gods. A Levitical redactor (R^{III}) supported claims of the Levites. Jepsen's *nebiistischen* redactor (R^{II}) corresponds to Noth's Dtr, who asserted the authority of the *nabî'im* but on a larger scale than that of Jepsen's redactor.⁸

Unwilling to accept Noth's hypothesis that Israel's history had resulted in a religious failure to obey YHWH, Gerhard von Rad (1957) presented a more theological hypothesis about the DH as an expression of an eternal covenant.⁹ In 2 Samuel 7, YHWH made a so-called "everlasting covenant" (*bārît 'ôlam*) with David. Von Rad put much faith in this passage, but, according to the present study, the text does not use the words *bārît 'ôlam* together. The text does not even use the word *bārît* in the chapter. It says, "your house and your kingdom/sovereignty will last forever" (*wə-ne'man bêtākā û-mamlaktākā*

⁷ Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*; Weippert, "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk," 226–29; Van Seters, "Deuteronomist," 370.

⁸ Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 14–20.

⁹ Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 306–11.

‘*ad ‘ôlam*). Under the authority of YHWH, the *nābî’* Nathan makes one promise to one obedient ruler and his household concerning his sovereignty lasting forever but says nothing about YHWH’s covenant with the people. Not long after that, Nathan the *nābî’* cursed David’s descendants: *wā-‘attāh lō’-tāsûr hereb mib-bêtkā ‘ad-‘ôlām* (and now the sword will not depart from your house forever; 2 Sam 12:10). Then YHWH killed the same leader’s son: *way-yiggōp yhw h ‘et-hay-yeled* (YHWH struck the child; 2 Sam 12:15).

Rudolf Smend (1971) of the Göttingen school has utilized the method of redaction criticism to identify traces of several editor redactors throughout the DH. He gave the title of DtrG (*Geschichtswerk*; historiography) editor to the original author (Noth’s Dtr) and identified a second principal editor as DtrN (*nomistische*; legal) editor.¹⁰ Smend found this so-called “legal” editor at the end of the book of Deuteronomy in the speech of YHWH to Joshua about keeping the “law” (by which he meant the “book of instruction,” *sēper hat-tôrāh*) in mind in order to carry out the conquest (Josh 1:1–9). According to Smend, the reiterated motif of obedience to the *sēper hat-tôrāh* appears anomalous to the narrative context of the military conquest of Canaan, and this anomaly points to the activity of the two editors: DtrG (historiographer), who relates the narrative of Joshua’s obedience to YHWH’s command for conquest; and DtrN (*tôrāh*), who reiterates the motif of obedience to the *tôrāh*.

Smend’s study both clarifies and confuses the issue. A contrast exists between the historical narrative in DH, represented by DtrG (historiographer), and the teaching that DtrN (*tôrāh*) represents. The characters of the DtrG do not follow the inconsistent *sēper hat-tôrāh*, and DtrN (*tôrāh*) does not specify what following and studying the *sēper hat-tôrāh* entails. Smend’s identification of the *sēper hat-tôrāh* as a *nomistische* “law” book (DtrN), however, points to a source of confusion in biblical scholarship and its understanding of what constitutes a law.

Another member of the Göttingen school, Walter Dietrich (1972), identified a third stratum of writing that he called DtrP (*prophetische*) that focuses on the *nābî’îm*.¹¹ The identification of the *nābî’* with the *προφήτης* of Greece, however, points to another source of confusion over the role of the *nābî’îm* in Judahite society and in the DH. The word *προφήτης* in Greece refers to diviners, but the *nābî’îm* of Israel despise diviners. DtrP (*nābî’îm*), nonetheless, appears in the books of Kings and specifies which command and which law the kings and the people disobeyed. Accordingly, the *nābî’îm* of YHWH condemn the kings of Israel for their production of *‘ēlōhîm ‘āhērîm û-mas-sēkôt* (other gods and images), make promises to submissive kings but do not for-

¹⁰ Smend, “Das Gesetz,” 494–509.

¹¹ Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 8–12.

give them, and record the fulfillment of their warnings and condemnations, and slaughter the *nābî'im* of Ba'al, as in the following passages:¹²

The *nābî'* ... Ahijah said ... Go, tell Jeroboam, thus says YHWH god of Israel ... you made for yourself other gods and images ... I shall bring evil upon the house of Jeroboam" (1 Kgs 14:2, 6–10).

YHWH said by his servants the *nābî'im* ... "Because king Manasseh has committed these abominations ... has caused Judah to sin with his idols ... I shall give them into the hand of their enemies" (2 Kgs 21:10–15).

The word of YHWH came to Elijah ... "Ahab has humbled himself ... I shall not bring the disaster in his days but in his son's days, I shall bring disaster on his house" (1 Kgs 21:27–29).

Baasha ... killed all the house of Jeroboam ... according to the word of YHWH ... because of the sins of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 15:29).

Elijah said to them, "Seize the prophets of Ba'al! Do not let one from among them escape!" Thus they seized them, and Elijah brought them down to the valley of Qishon and slaughtered them there (1 Kgs 18:40).

Dietrich's DtrP (*nābî'im*) source thus defines the role of the *nābî'im* as spokespersons for YHWH and describes what the kings and the people did to offend YHWH—they paid attention to the *'ēlōhîm 'āhērîm*.

The literary analysis of Moshe Weinfeld (1972) brought out coherent covenant themes and terminology throughout the DH.¹³ He thus supports Noth's single-author hypothesis, as the following key terms express: (1) exodus and election, (2) land as inheritance, (3) conquest and annihilation, (4) single god, (5) hatred of other gods, (6) authority of *nābî'im*, (7) obedience, (8) promise of success and dynasty, (9) centralization of worship, (10) disobedience, and (11) enforcement and punishment. Within this thematic coherence, Weinfeld attributes the diversity of the sources to a plurality of scribes in Jerusalem during the Hezekiah-Josiah period (eighth–seventh cent. B.C.E.), who compiled disparate traditions to create a coherent deuteronomic myth.¹⁴

Weinfeld points out the revolutionary nature of the change in religion, politics, and history that took place within the Josianic reform.¹⁵ The centralization of the cult represented a sweeping, evolutionary innovation that eliminated existing provincial cults and transformed the religion into a more abstract and rational faith. The so-called "name theology" of YHWH thus re-

¹² Ibid., 20–21.

¹³ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 320–56.

¹⁴ Ibid., 158–64.

¹⁵ Ibid., 37.

flected a new and unique theological conception of YHWH as distinct from material ties such as the temple. A clear expression of Dtr's new theology occurs in the Solomonic speech, which portrays YHWH living in heaven rather than in the temple. It shifts the perception of YHWH's theophany from the visual to the aural and eliminates the corporeality of YHWH (1 Kings 8:27).¹⁶ According to Weinfeld, Dtr's "rational" approach to cult and ritual (Deuteronomy 12–19) mirror the change in religious beliefs that occurred with the reform and the more abstract concept of centralized worship of YHWH's name at the chosen place.¹⁷

Yet Weinfeld's analysis contradicts the claim of Dtr that the Josianic reform and the Deuteronomistic program represent a return to the pristine and original covenantal relationship of YHWH and his *nābî* Moses, which the people had lost because of their *Abfall* and *Verfall*. Although recognizing the revolutionary nature of Dtr's program, Weinfeld does not look far for its source. Deuteronomy, he claims, has roots in Samaria and Israel as the importance of the Shechemite tradition of Gerizim and Ebal reveals. Following the course of history as presented by the DH, Weinfeld attributes the reforms of Hezekiah (eighth cent. B.C.E.) and Josiah (seventh cent. B.C.E.) to the efforts of the *nābî'im* from Israel and Samaria to purify the cult of pagan elements. By the term "pagan elements," Weinfeld refers to the local, indigenous, ubiquitous, and ancient *bā'alim* of Canaan. Dtr's polemic against the *bā'alim*, the *bāmôt*, the *maššēbôt*, and the *'ašērôt* to the *'ēlōhîm 'āḥērîm* and even local, decentralized altars to YHWH, represents the struggle to purge Canaanite cult from the centralized cult of Jerusalem.¹⁸ Weinfeld does not ask what phenomenon in the ninth through seventh centuries B.C.E. started the Israelite and Judahite opposition to local Canaanite culture and triggered such hatred for local traditions and religion.

The command of YHWH for the *herem* (ban; extermination) of the Canaanite population occurred at this time. Because he could not conceive of a massive slaughter by command of YHWH, Weinfeld calls this command "utopian and unheard of in the historical accounts of Israel."¹⁹ It reflected the bitter historical struggle with the Canaanite religion and culture. In classic literary foreshadowing, however, the doctrine of the *herem* also applied to apostate cities within the state (Deut 13:12–18) and in the end to the state itself (2 Kgs 26–27). Again Weinfeld attributes the "ancient doctrine of *herem*" to political theory from Samaria and Israel.²⁰ Weinfeld's analysis illuminates both the astounding facts of the matter and the limited scope of his explanation.

¹⁶ Ibid., 37–39.

¹⁷ Ibid., 40–42.

¹⁸ Ibid., 44–46.

¹⁹ Ibid., 51–52.

²⁰ Ibid.

Weinfeld's study of the situation in Israel and Samaria brings out an important facet of the DH and suggests an adjustment in its terminology for the exiles. The fall and exile of the Israelite people of Samaria and Israel began in 732 B.C.E. with the conquest of Tiglath-pileser III, which the DH interpreted as YHWH's punishment for their worship of Baal and the golden calves. According to Weinfeld, this early experience of exile started the longing for return to the homeland that appears prevalent in Deuteronomic literature. The theme of exile and return in Israelite and Judahite culture started two centuries (245 years) before the Babylonian exile.²¹ After the final fall of Samaria and Israel in 721 B.C.E., more people went into resettlement across the empire, the population of Jerusalem and Judah expanded with more refugees from Samaria and Israel. Even more resettlement occurred and more refugees went into exile after Sennacherib's conquest of Judah in 701 B.C.E. By the time of Josiah (640–609 B.C.E.) and the probable first composition of the DH, Israel and Samaria and the cities of Judah had gone into exile in Assyria. The city of Jerusalem remained alone, and, if normal Assyrian policy applied, deportees from nations of the eastern Assyrian empire had taken over the surrounding land. Thus in analyzing this theme of the exile in Dtr, one need not assume that the reference to exile refers to the Babylonian exile.

Following on von Rad's theological hypothesis from the book of 2 Samuel, Frank M. Cross (1973) finds two theological themes and two editors, Dtr₁ and Dtr₂, in his analysis of the book of Kings. He proposes that the first theme developed during the Josianic period (seventh cent. B.C.E.) as part of the reform and revival.²² Cross identifies in 2 Samuel 7 the theme of YHWH's choice of David for a permanent dynasty and Jerusalem as a permanent place for YHWH's name. This theme of grace and hope would counter the dark theme of the exile. A second theme, the so-called "sins of Jeroboam," refers to Jeroboam's establishment of cult sites to the *'ēlohîm 'ăḥērîm*, *bā'alîm*, *bāmôt*, *'ăšērôt*, and *maṣṣēbôt* in Bethel and Dan after the break-up of the unified state under the control of YHWH and the *nābî'im* (2 Kgs 17:1–23). This crime would account for the exile in Dtr's view.

From the viewpoint of the DH and of this study, however, Cross's two themes can play no more than a minor role. First, Jeroboam's acceptance of the *'ēlohîm 'ăḥērîm* represents a single instance of a general pattern of disobedience to YHWH and the *nābî'im* that cuts across the whole DH. The presence of the *'ēlohîm 'ăḥērîm*, *bā'alîm*, *bāmôt*, *'ăšērôt*, and *maṣṣēbôt*, however, points to the even deeper and more serious offense. Even the *nābî'* Moses could not enter the land of Canaan because of his disobedience (*gam bî hi'annap yhwh* "even with me is YHWH angry"; Deut 1:37) and his loss of faith (*'al 'ăšer*

²¹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 47–48.

²² Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 278–82.

mā'altem bî “because you acted treacherously with me”; Deut 32:51). Second, David's loyalty guaranteed no more than a limited protection for his person alone during his lifetime; the *nābî* Nathan cursed David's innocent posterity (*wā-attāh lō-tāsōr hereb mib-bêt-ākā ad-ōlām* “now the sword will not depart from your house forever”; 2 Sam 12:10), and YHWH killed his innocent son for his crimes (*way-yiggōp yhwh 'et-hay-yeled*; 2 Sam 12:15).

This royal ideology, that YHWH had promised an eternal throne to David's house and patrimony, however, might have constituted the platform of Josiah's reform, according to Cross. He thus proposed that a first edition of the book of Kings, Dtr₁ (preexilic), praised David as the model king and functioned as a propaganda work of the Josianic reformation and its imperial program in the seventh century B.C.E.²³ A later exilic edition of DH, Dtr₂ (exilic), updated the DH to record the fall of Jerusalem and to refine the theology in view of the sins of Jeroboam of Israel and those of Manasseh of Judah, who had defiled the temple of YHWH's name with a statue of Asherah (2 Kgs 21:2–15). The exilic author, Dtr₂, addressed the exiles, called for repentance, and promised restoration to the land. Cross's thematic analysis of the authors Dtr₁ (preexilic) and Dtr₂ (exilic) presents a plausible context for the creation of the DH but, like other studies of the DH, lacks a wider and deeper view of the historical forces surrounding the authors of the DH in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E.

While Smend and Dietrich traced the Göttingen school's three strata of redaction—DtrG, DtrP, and DtrN—through the books of Joshua, Judges, and Kings, Timo Veijola (1975) traced the eternal dynasty of David into the book of Samuel.²⁴ The preexilic historian DtrG (historiographer) (2 Sam 3:18) describes David in a positive light as the servant *'ebed* (servant) of YHWH, just like Moses the *nābî* (Deut 34:5) and Joshua (Josh 24:29). Because David practiced rightness and justice (*'šh mšpṭ w-šdqh*), according to DtrG (historiography), YHWH legitimated his house for an everlasting dynasty. DtrP (*nābî'im*), however, took a negative stance to David and did not designate the king as an *'ebed* of YHWH. DtrP did not legitimate the dynasty of David (2 Sam 12:7, 8) and did not use the term for eternity (*'d wlm*) except in a condemnation: “Now the sword shall never (*'d wlm*) depart from your [David's] house, for you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife” (2 Sam 12:10). The so-called DtrN (*tôrāh*) gives David alone among the kings the same title of obedient *'ebed*.²⁵ DtrN also reserves the title *nāgîd* (leader) for David (1 Sam 13:14). According to Veijola, DtrN (*tôrāh*) portrayed David as the founder of the house that would enjoy the eternal favor of YHWH (2 Sam 22:51) as long as his descendants maintained adherence to the *sēper hat-tôrāh*.

²³ Ibid., 284–85.

²⁴ Veijola, *Die Ewige Dynastie*. 127–32.

²⁵ Ibid., 141–42.

Veijola's study clarifies the different emphases of the sources concerning the eternal dynasty of David. Accordingly, DtrG (historiographer) makes the promise, but DtrP (*nābî'im*) curses his house. Veijola also indicates the way in which the editors work together to make a point about the kings' dependence on the authority of YHWH and their subservience to the *nābî'im*. The role of DtrN (*tôrāh*), however, remains obscure in this analysis because DtrN never specifies which laws, commands, or instructions of the *sēper hat-tôrāh* it means. It presents an ambiguous portrait of a law-abiding citizen, who may follow the ten words, the expansive *sēper hat-tôrāh*, and, at the same time, carry out YHWH's command for the extermination of populations for no offense. Besides that, the *sēper hat-tôrāh* remained optional, and David's behavior, despite DtrN's positive evaluation, evinces a sense of lawless aggression and invulnerability, contrary to the "ten words on the two tablets of stones" (*ʿāšeret had-dabārîm ʿal-šnê lûḥôt ʾābānîm*; Deuteronomy 4–5), but justified by loyal military service to YHWH.

Veijola introduces a new late-stage literary stratum with the characteristics of a nationalistic theology, which he calls DtrB (*bundestheologische deuteronomistische Redaktion*).²⁶ The traces of this redaction discuss the problems of segregation from the people of the land of Canaan and the plan for a theological constitution (Deut 7:5; Deut 7:12–8:20; Deuteronomy 13). DtrB (nationalist theologian), therefore, appears to stem from the postexilic concerns of the returnees to the Persian province of Yehud. It deals further with concerns of blessings, land cultivation, obedience to the law, and the remission (*schəmiṭṭa*) law (Deut 15:1–11). Veijola identifies this redaction in the clause in the *ʿāšeret had-dabārîm* forbidding *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* (Deut 5:6–9), to the nationalistic rules (Deut 10:10–11:31), and to the interest in the agricultural feast calendar (Deut 16:1–17).²⁷

As Hans-Detlef Hoffmann (1980) asserts, perhaps Dtr composed the DH in a postexilic setting with a minimal use of sources to portray the history of Israel as a cult history motivated by cult reform. Dtr shaped sources, traditions, and patterns into a fictive narrative with historical verisimilitude (Deut 9:7–29; 1 Samuel 7; 28; 2 Kings 9). The cult reform, involved the systematic rejection of *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* and their shrines, and Hoffmann focuses on the formulaic vocabulary that expresses the polarity and hostility to the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm*: for example, *hlk / ʿbd / ḥšthwh / bəʿalîm / hbl / h-glwlwm / h-štrwt / h-šrym / šbʾ h-šmym* (He goes after, serves, worships, *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm*, the emptiness, the dung balls, the Aštaroth, the Asherîm, and the army of heaven).²⁸ The cult reform meant destroying the offending gods: "This is how you must deal with them: break down their altars, smash their pillars,

²⁶ Idem, "Bundestheologische Redaktion im Deuteronomium," 242–76.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen*, 316–18.

hew down their sacred poles, and burn their idols with fire" (Deut 7:5).²⁹ Hoffmann's analysis captures a valid and important part of the deuteronomistic plan to sanctify the land of Canaan to YHWH but leaves out the valid and extraordinary plan for the annihilation of the people who followed the *'ēlōhīm 'āhērīm*. Would a conflict of cult mannerisms induce extermination? Or would the larger matter of ownership of the land of Canaan and political control suffice to kill its inhabitants?

The single-exilic-author hypothesis, however, finds support among scholars, like Richard D. Nelson (1981), because Noth provided evidence of the literary unity of the DH by means of coherent programmatic speeches, consistent chronology, single purpose of using history as explanation of disaster, and a consistent schema of *nabî'im* predictions and fulfillment.³⁰ Nelson holds, however, that the original preexilic scrolls consisted of propaganda work from Josiah's reign as a justification of his god-inspired rule and that the exilic redactor did not hope for a return to the land of Canaan (1 Kgs 8:50) or for a continuation of the Davidic dynasty (2 Kgs 25:27–30).

According to Nelson, four theological issues confirm Cross's historical dates of his two Dtr editors in the seventh century B.C.E.: (1) Josianic Dtr₁ (preexilic) used the ark as a nationalist symbol, but Dtr₂ (exilic) had no interest in it. (2) The concept of a total conquest of the land of Canaan meshes with the Josianic nationalistic feeling of the time and the boundaries given in Deut 1:7 and Josh 1:4. (3) Dtr₁ retrojected the royal character of Josiah into his depiction of Joshua and David, and the exilic editor, Dtr₂, blamed seventh century B.C.E. Manasseh for the ultimate disaster. (4) Josiah reversed Jeroboam's curse by destroying the altar in Bethel.³¹ Accordingly, the four theological issues also reveal a concern for nationalism, which in turn characterizes the DH version of seventh century B.C.E.

Norbert Lohfink (1981) has found yet another stratum of composition that led to a discussion of a broader basis for the DH.³² From a study of the *kerygmata* in the deuteronomic law and the literary-critical usage of the verb *yrš* (take possession of; inherit) with respect to the conquest of the land of Canaan, Lohfink proposed that a stratum of composition, DtrL (*deuteronomistische Landerobierungserzählung*; deuteronomistic narrative of the conquest of the land), runs from Deuteronomy 1 to Joshua 22. The first part of DtrL (Deuteronomy 1–3) has the form of a retrospective view. The second part (Deuteronomy 4–31) contains the *sēper hat-tôrāh*, and the third part tells the actual conquest tale (Deuteronomy 31–Joshua 22).³³ Lohfink called this source DtrL because it tells a consistent story of the conquest of the land

²⁹ Ibid., 327–49.

³⁰ Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 13–14.

³¹ Ibid., 123–26.

³² Lohfink, "Kerygmata," 87–100.

³³ Ibid.

from the announcement at Horeb, to the extermination (*hērem*) of the populations, to the appropriation (*yāraš*) of the land of Canaan, and to its allotment in Joshua 22. The portions of the *sēper hat-tôrah* in Deuteronomy 5, 7, and 9 confirm the command of YHWH as part of the law and instruction manual of the *nābî* ruler.³⁴

In the view of the present study, DtrL (*Landerobierungserzählung*) thus presupposes an imperial concept of war that establishes the legal title for the appropriation of land if the national god has provided a warrant, and the army has conquered and exterminated or removed the previous inhabitants. Thus YHWH of DtrL had universal jurisdiction, at least in the mind of Dtr, and had already signed the oath of warrant to the ancestors of the people. Lohfink's study indicates that the DH has unexplored roots and a larger and wider social and international political context than previous studies of the DH have observed.

According to Hans Walter Wolff (1982), the exilic DH describes YHWH's punishment of the people and the destruction of their state because of their disobedience to the "law" (DtrN, *tôrah*) and to the word of Moses and YHWH (DtrG, historiographer).³⁵ Later exilic redaction of the DH leaves room for hope that the exiled people may cry for help to YHWH and that the proclamation for a return (*šûb*, *šûbû*, *wā-šābû*, and *tāšûb*) constitutes the lasting message of the DH. Wolff's analysis captures the aspect of the necessity for obedience in the DH but does not distinguish the content of the law versus the word of the *nābî* Moses and YHWH.

According to Andrew D. H. Mayes (1983), the unity of the DH rests on its consistent theology of observance of the law.³⁶ The "law code" (*sēper hat-tôrah*) in Deuteronomy 6–25, according to Mayes, concerned centralization of worship and had a separate existence from the deuteronomistic tradition of Horeb until Dtr put them together.³⁷ Dtr combined the idea that YHWH led the people to conquer the land of Canaan under the warrant of an imperial law established by YHWH (Deut 7:1–3, 6, 17–24; 9:1–6; and 20). The continued observance of the law introduced a conditional element into the covenant that then dominated the DH (Josh 1:7–9; 13:1–6). Mayes traces two layers, each with its own concerns, through each of the books. Dtr₁ (pre-exilic) linked the prosperity of Israel to obedience of the law of Moses while Dtr₂ (exilic) made explicit the primary demand of Israel's exclusive allegiance to YHWH.

Although Mayes interprets the theology of the DH as a relationship of obedience to the law of Moses in Deuteronomy, this appraisal reiterates the claim of the DH itself and does not explain in a historical or logical sense the

³⁴ Ibid., 94–96.

³⁵ Wolff, "Kerygma," 83–100.

³⁶ Mayes, *Story of Israel*, 4–6.

³⁷ Ibid., 15–38.

relationship between YHWH's command in Deuteronomy 1 to annihilate the population of the land and the code of social, cultic, and juridical instruction that includes the centralization of worship. This exegetical analysis depends on the limited material within the DH itself and does not solve the problem of the purpose or the origin of YHWH with the imperial program.

Following on the early hypothesis of Jepsen that the books of Kings had three priestly redactions, Helga Weippert (1985) dates redactor 1 (R^I) to the period of Hezekiah, redactor 2 (R^{II}) to the period of Josiah, and redactor 3 (R^{III}) to the exilic period.³⁸ The first redactor approved of Hezekiah the king of Judah. The second redactor condemned the kings of Samaria and Israel and Jerusalem/Judah for their complicity with Jeroboam's crime of setting up the *bāmôt*, *maṣṣēbôt*, and the *ʾašērôt* to the *ʾēlōhîm ʾăḥērîm*. The third redactor covered the last four kings in a neutral and schematic way as if in retrospect. Weippert's theory thus spans the late eighth, seventh, and early sixth centuries B.C.E.

By proposing that pre-Dtr narrative sources and scrolls focused on history and figures rather than on fundamental themes, Mark A. O'Brien (1989) paints a variant picture of the development of the DH.³⁹ The early narratives reflected stages of development in the tradition of life in the land, and the earlier scribes would have used the archives, chronicles, and sources of the library in Jerusalem to create the traditions. Such an elaborate history could not have emerged except from a settled group of scribes in a library, and references to exile could thus indicate the earlier exiles of 732, 721, and 701 B.C.E. The exiles in Babylon would not have had access to their sources, but the authors of the DH could have linked the sources into a narrative in a chronological sequence and used them to explain the cause of the exile. This assertion, however, carries the assumption that the Babylonians would allow prisoners of war to transport their library into exile.

According to O'Brien, Dtr used two major sources. The first scroll recounted the troubled times of the premonarchic period and the cycles of apostasy and deliverance.⁴⁰ The second scroll (ninth cent. B.C.E.) began with the *nābîʾ* Samuel and recounted the story of Saul, David, Solomon, and Jehu. This source established the *nābîʾîm* as the authorities of YHWH with the power to make and break kings according to their obedience.⁴¹ It created a schema of history that linked it to the paradigmatic speech of Moses, the first *nābîʾ*, according to which the *nābîʾîm* directed the monarchy according to three deuteronomic criteria: fidelity to YHWH, centralized worship, and obedience to the command of YHWH's authorized *nābîʾîm*.⁴² Dtr cast Jeroboam's

³⁸ Weippert, "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk," 243–44.

³⁹ O'Brien, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 289.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 290.

⁴² *Ibid.*

crime as that of infidelity to the exclusive centralized worship of the DH god because Jeroboam had disobeyed the word of the *nābîʾ* Ahijah. David, by contrast, acted on his fidelity to YHWH and the *nābîʾ* and received the promise of an enduring dynasty.⁴³

Dtr wrote the contemporaneous story of Josiah in the seventh century B.C.E. without sources, according to O'Brien, and portrayed Josiah as a model king in line with David and Hezekiah. The so-called rediscovery of the *tôrāh* indicates Dtr's sense of a new beginning. DH thus represents a new and unique contribution to history, literature, and thought, which the exile threatened to extinguish. Subsequent redaction, however, adapted it to account for the exile.⁴⁴

O'Brien accounts for the various redactors. The first redaction (DtrH; historian) added the stilted account of the four kings subsequent to Josiah. The second redaction (DtrP, voice of the *nābîʾîm*) applied Dtr's critique to the Judahite kings like Manasseh. A third redaction (DtrN, *nomistische*) focused on the *sēper hat-tôrāh* (book of teaching) and the people and recast the whole DH as the people's disobedience to the deuteronomic "law." It retained the *nābîʾîm* as YHWH's authorized interpreters of the teaching, appointers of kings, and makers of history. It constituted, however, a second edition of the DH as a history of the disobedience of the people to the "law" (*sēper hat-tôrāh*) rather than to the *nābîʾîm*.⁴⁵

O'Brien's analysis points to the crucial role that the author, Dtr, and even the later redactors assigned to the *nābîʾîm*. O'Brien makes clear that even if one interprets the offense of the people as disobedience to the law, as some interpreters suppose, the *nābîʾîm*, and the first and greatest *nābîʾ*, Moses, played the important role of writing and establishing the *tôrāh* as a form of law under control of the *nābîʾîm*. The real power lay not in the ambiguous "law," but in the hands of the *nābîʾîm*, the scribal authors, who had placed themselves in power. DtrN did not take away the power of the *nābîʾîm* to interpret the *sēper hat-tôrāh*.

The term "Dtr" designates a literary style influenced by the Assyrian annals of Esarhaddon, according to Ernst Axel Knauf (1996).⁴⁶ Thus the style, theology, and ideology of the conquest of a promised land and covenant as a vassal treaty derive from Assyrian imperialism. The difficulties and contradictions encountered in the effort to explain the DH without recourse to Assyrian imperial documents force one to abandon the concept of a historiographical work.⁴⁷ The DH consists of propagandistic hero legends of military leaders and novellas about people favored by YHWH. Deuteronomy,

⁴³ Ibid., 290–91.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 291.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 291–92.

⁴⁶ Knauf, "Does 'Deuteronomistic Historiography' (DtrH) Exist?" 388–98.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

however, functions as wisdom instruction and starts by citing its absolute authority while Joshua–2 Kings functions to support that authority and does not contain a coherent view of Israel's history.⁴⁸ Knauf denies the existence of a DH as history but points to three consistent themes: the favor of YHWH, the centralized divine authority, and Assyrian imperialism.

The concept of an exclusive holy people and the Deuteronomic demand to kill or expel the indigenous populations from the land of Canaan as dangerous foreign influences could make sense in the Josianic period in the seventh century B.C.E. after a century of Assyrian domination, according to Rainer Albertz (1996).⁴⁹ The similarity between the Deuteronomic concept of covenant and the covenant of the Assyrian treaties make a seventh century dating possible. Yet Albertz in a later contribution attributes the authorship of the DH (DtrG, historiographer) to competing families living in Babylon in the late exilic period.⁵⁰

According to Nadav Na'aman (1998), no evidence of a library or even a city large enough to sustain scribal activity existed in Jerusalem before the eighth century B.C.E. Under the influence of the Assyrian empire (eighth and seventh cent. B.C.E.), the provincial capital city of Jerusalem would have had an imperial library in its temple for the use of the educated professional elite. The author of the book of Kings would have had access to those sources in the Jerusalem library.⁵¹ Such a library would have resembled the library of Aššurbanipal in Nineveh (seventh cent. B.C.E.), which contained the literature of Mesopotamia such as omen texts, epic literature, wisdom literature, myth, incantations, prayers, and sign lists. Other imperial Assyrian libraries would have contained the same texts in some measure, as did the Sultantepe/Huzirina library (southern Turkey, eighth and seventh cent. B.C.E.), for instance, which contained a comprehensive collection of Neo-Assyrian texts that belonged to a family of *šangu*-priests.⁵²

The Jerusalem library would have disappeared with the destruction of 587 B.C.E., according to Na'aman, but the author of the first edition of Kings (Dtr₁, preexilic) would have had access to the library. At the same time, Dtr₁ had no written sources for his near contemporaries Manasseh, Amon, and Josiah. Dtr₁ concluded with the reform of Josiah (2 Kgs 23:21–23). The second author (Dtr₂, exilic) lived in Babylonia and updated, completed, revised, and adapted the work of Dtr₁ to the circumstances after the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile to Babylonia without the benefit of a library. Na'aman's discussion of the library raises a problem for Noth's theory of an exilic author and even for the various theories of exilic and postexilic redactions.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 394.

⁴⁹ Albertz, "Why a Reform," 33.

⁵⁰ Idem, "In Search of the Deuteronomists," 15.

⁵¹ Na'aman, "Temple Library of Jerusalem," 129–52.

⁵² Ibid.; Gurney, "Sultantepe Tablets"; Gurney and Finkelstein, *Sultantepe Tablets*.

How did they work without their library? Theories involving exilic and postexilic authors or redactions presuppose careful transport, under pressure of wartime deportations, of the scrolls to Babylonia and then a viable community setting suitable for authorial work.

The issue of dating the DH remains problematical, according to Richard Coggins (1999).⁵³ The concept of origins in Samaria and Israel remains because of Dtr's skeptical attitude to monarchy, the role of *nabî'im* as covenant mediators, and the use of terminology. According to Coggins, religious leaders fled to Judah and Jerusalem after the fall of Israel and Samaria (721 B.C.E.) and wrote the book of Deuteronomy, which appeared later in the time of Josiah (640–609 B.C.E.), who discovered it in the temple and initiated a preexilic Deuteronomistic reform.⁵⁴ Coggins's innerbiblical exegesis follows the account in the DH.

Thomas Römer (2000) pushes the date of the redactors of the DH forward into the Babylonian and Persian periods but acknowledges that the first author of the Deuteronomistic History (DtrG, historiographer) worked within the royal court of Josiah to produce propaganda in order to reinforce the legitimacy of Josiah.⁵⁵ As Römer proposes, early deuteronomistic scribes invented the conquest tradition in the context of the Neo-Assyrian occupation of Judah. DtrG wrote an Assyrian-style conquest account to legitimize Judah's claim to the land of Canaan in the name of YHWH. DtrG (historiographer) reflects the political change that took place in the Levant in the seventh century B.C.E. when the kingdoms of the Levant had fallen under Assyrian domination. After 722 B.C.E., the population of Jerusalem surged and changed from a small town of twelve acres and 1000 inhabitants to a huge urban area of 150 acres, and a population of 15,000 inhabitants. Römer attributes this growth to Judah's integration into the Assyrian imperial market and an influx of Assyrian deportees and traders rather than, as many other scholars (following DH) claim, to an influx of refugees from Samaria.

According to Römer, however, the theme of the loss of land could indicate nothing but the Babylonian exile.⁵⁶ He presents thus a layer theory of three editions of the DH: (1) the seventh-century B.C.E. Josianic Neo-Assyrian source edition, (2) the early sixth-century B.C.E. exilic Babylonian collated edition, and (3) the late sixth-century B.C.E. Persian edition. Elements of the deuteronomistic covenant that involve a universal creator god and a demand for segregation from the people of the land, Römer asserts, come from the later Persian period. Römer's analysis has provoked some responses from other scholars.

⁵³ Coggins, "What Does 'Deuteronomistic' Mean?" 23–24.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 69–71.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 69–71.

The Göttingen school continues to multiply redactional layers, according to H. N. Rösel (2000), and some recent scholars have tended to deny the existence of the DH as identified by Noth.⁵⁷ A single author of the DH would have introduced a basic principle for the work as a whole, but Rösel finds no evidence of a comprehensive literary principle in the DH beyond the motif of sin with regard to *'ēlōhîm 'āḥērîm* and the motif of the anger of YHWH.⁵⁸ Neither of these principles, in his opinion, affects the political catastrophe at the end.

The composition of the Deuteronomistic History, according to Mario Liverani (2005), started with the reform of Josiah and his scholars and scribes and extended for several generations until the final disaster of the kingdom of Judah.⁵⁹ The DH thus describes the loyalty or disloyalty of Judah and Israel to the covenant, and the covenant consists of the fundamental principle of exclusiveness of worship to YHWH and its centralization in Jerusalem.

Philip Davies (2005) questions the historicity of the so-called Josianic reform since no political vacuum followed the Assyrian withdrawal in the late seventh century B.C.E., and no real king in power would accept a reform (Deut 17:14–15) that would deprive his office of the powers of warfare and justice.⁶⁰ The present method of dating Deuteronomy, claims Davies, depends on inadequate internal evidence and the history of Judah as related in the DH. The Canaanite nations shared religious practices, and Israel did not need to conquer and annihilate the previous occupants of YHWH's land because of their abhorrent *'ēlōhîm 'āḥērîm*.⁶¹ Davies thus understands the call to battle as an ideological ploy meant to rally support for the authors of the DH over the issue of land ownership in the postexilic situation. Davies concludes that Deuteronomy fits into a postexilic context of an immigrant population, based around a temple in Jerusalem, in conflict with its indigenous neighbors, under a written law, and controlled by the priesthood. Thus he sets the place and date of its composition in Jerusalem in the Persian period between Cyrus II (559–530 B.C.E.) and Darius III (336–330 B.C.E.).

On the other hand, the DH phrase, *'ad hayôm haz-zeh* (until this day; Josh 4:9), according to Jeffrey Geoghegan (2006), indicates a deuteronomistic editor of the late seventh century B.C.E. after the destruction of Israel (721 B.C.E.) and before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 586 B.C.E.⁶² Geoghegan's innerbiblical analysis of the DH follows the historiography of the DH and the idea that northern prophets fled from the destruction

⁵⁷ Römer, *Future of the Deuteronomistic History*, viii–ix.

⁵⁸ Rösel, "Does a Comprehensive 'Leitmotiv'?" 195–212.

⁵⁹ Liverani, *Israel's History*, 179.

⁶⁰ Davies, "Josiah and the Law Book," 65–77.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 65–72.

⁶² Geoghegan, *Time*, 92.

of Israel, took up residence in Judah, and became part of the ruling class of Judah.

Noth's model of a DH, according to Kurt L. Noll (2007), does not explain the diversity of opinion expressed in the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings.⁶³ Deuteronomy reflects the form, purpose, and intent of the Assyrian vassal treaties. Joshua's narrative depends on Assyrian conquest accounts, and Joshua 10 may recall Sennacherib's invasion in 701 B.C.E. The book of "Judges" may represent a memory of Canaanite conditions before the imposition of imperial rule from Jerusalem. Samuel has characteristics of a novella about the rise of military leaders, who worship YHWH and obey the *nābî'im*. Kings resembles royal imperial annals and king lists from Assyria. Noll proposes that the scribes (*nābî'im*) of Jerusalem composed these books in the seventh century B.C.E. while under the political assimilation of the empire.⁶⁴ Noll's study appears limited by his focus on the literary parallels of Deuteronomy and the NA vassal treaties. Deuteronomy and the DH, however, attest to an imperial policy and law that goes beyond the unilateral subjugation treaties of the empire.

Othman Keel's (2007) analysis of Deuteronomy follows the same literary pattern that Noll recognized. Keel begins with an outline of Deuteronomy that sums up the first four chapters as a historical review of the wandering from Horeb. His outline emphasizes Deuteronomy's formal correlation with the NA covenant treaty. In his view neither the solar god of Jerusalem nor the peaceful compromising god of the father plays a significant role in the DH, but instead the "militant, violent, living YHWH" demands the exclusive binding of the people, threatens curses for disobedience, and promises love for obedience. Deuteronomy systematized the treaty relationship of YHWH to the people based on the premises of a historical relationship according to which the people owe their existence, freedom, and independence to YHWH. In this treaty YHWH swore the land to the people and demanded the merciless conquest and extermination of the earlier inhabitants for their atrocities as a prerequisite for the settlement of the land. Keel makes an important point here by noting that the extermination constituted the prerequisite for the successful inhabitation of the land. This stipulation, rather than the oft-repeated stipulation in Deuteronomy and the DH to observe the *tôrât mōšeh*, guides the actions of the characters in the DH.⁶⁵

According to Keel, the traditions of Elijah and the *nābî'im* of the northern kingdom, with their rejection of Canaanite Ba'al and their demand for the return to YHWH and Moses as recorded at Gerizim and Ebal, preceded the NA covenant of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy thus reflects the later seventh-century-B.C.E. interests of Josiah, the Assyrian party of landed gentry of

⁶³ Noll, "Deuteronomistic History or Deuteronomic Debate?" 311.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 334.

⁶⁵ Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems*, 577–81.

Judah, and the royal servants and temple priests of Jerusalem. The core of Deuteronomy consists of the command in Deut 6:4 and its binding of the people to Jerusalem's unique YHWH vis-à-vis the other YHWHs (Šōmrōn, Teman, Bet-El, and Dan).⁶⁶

Keel perceives the basic theological belief of DtrG as that of a national covenant founded on the historical service of YHWH to Israel, established in the Decalogue, and developed in the code of law/*tôrāh*. In the view of this covenant, the apostasy (*Abfall*) of Manasseh justified YHWH's destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 587 B.C.E. Further, this concept came to Judah with the *nābî'im* exiles during the destruction of Israel between 736 and 721 B.C.E. Thus the *nābî'im* of Israel, along with the landed gentry, the royal servants, and the temple priests developed the basic concepts of the covenant in Jerusalem before the exile to Babylon. In Babylon they subordinated the devastated institutions of king and temple to the law, which ensured the survival of the traditions in exile. As an attempt to understand a period of time by means of facts, data, and state and private archives, with particular reference to the anger of YHWH as the cause of the destruction of Jerusalem, the final form of exilic DtrG thus represents the oldest known history. Its sources, impetus, and initial form, however, emerge from the period of Josiah's reform.⁶⁷

Walter Dietrich (2008) recognizes both the diversity and unity in the DH.⁶⁸ His layer model (like Römer's) appreciates Noth's three basic contributions to the discipline. Under the scrutiny of German scholarship, however, the DH dissolves into smaller and smaller units of works, fragments, and datings that challenge the core of Noth's hypothesis. Yet, argues Dietrich, the DH exhibits continuous characteristic features and narrative threads that distinguish the periods and episodes. The historio-graphical objective of the DH appears in a reliable chronological record that corresponds to synchronic events from the environment of the Levant. This process reveals at least in principle an unbroken chronological course from Deuteronomy (thirteenth cent. B.C.E.) to 2 Kings (sixth cent. B.C.E.); the DH threads theological connections between the actions of the people with respect to YHWH.

The monarchy forms a wide and comprehensive theme throughout the DH, according to Dietrich.⁶⁹ Moses calls for a constitutional government (Deut 17:14–20) by *tôrāh*, and the corresponding discussion (Judges 8–9; 1 Samuel 8–12) about the monarchy reveals a direct connection between the Deuteronomic “king law” and the subsequent lives of the kings. The kings themselves caused problems, but monarchy per se did not cause the problems.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 582–83.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 593–97.

⁶⁸ Dietrich, “Vielfalt und Einheit,” 171–83.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 179–80.

The war instructions (Deut 20:10–18) provided orders for the so-called “excommunication” of the resident population, which Joshua put into effect (Joshua 6–12). Later passages indicate the difficulty that the people had in maintaining the excommunication (Josh 7:1; 1 Samuel 15; 1 Kgs 20:35–45), but still the *tôrāh* of Moses called for irreconcilable hostility toward all other non-YHWH people. According to Dietrich’s analysis, the Assyrians—who had destroyed and exiled the two kingdoms of Israel and Samaria and Judah but left the city of Jerusalem intact but subjugated—and their deportees from across the empire fit into this pattern of outsiders, whom the *tôrāh* condemned to death.

No single detail, according to Dietrich, suggests the existence of the DH as a planned historiographic composition, but the totality of the details indicates at least the versimilitude of a history from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings.⁷⁰ The last reported incident concerning the king Jehoiachin in Babylon in 562 B.C.E. suggests that the latest revision of the DH originated in the exilic or postexilic world. The technical aspect of the work and its theological intentions, however, assign its original composition to an earlier period. Dietrich thus assigns the date of the original DH (similar to Cross’s Dtr₁, preexilic) to the seventh century B.C.E. or earlier and the date of the later redactor to the lifetime of Jehoiachin.

Responding to Römer, Nelson (2009) agrees that Josiah’s reform triggered the writing of the DH. Nelson acknowledges the political and cultural domination of the colonizing power Assyria from 720–721 B.C.E. and throughout the seventh century B.C.E.⁷¹ Deuteronomy, according to Nelson, sounds like an “oppositional law book” that would subvert the Assyrian power. It reads like a revised Assyrian royal inscription intent on conquest and transformation of the land of Canaan into the holy land of YHWH. According to Nelson, Josiah thus reversed the subservient policies of Manasseh in an attempt to rid the land of superficial ties to Assyria and the local Canaanite gods. Nelson does not bring up the irony implicit in Josiah’s revised oppositional policy.

The mention of exile, according to Nelson, need not indicate a Babylonian exile but could refer to the exiles of Israel in 732, 721, and Judah in 701 B.C.E, which all reflect the Assyrian policy of destruction, deportation, and repopulation in the interests of transforming the land into the service of the god Aššur.⁷² Further, the theme of exile does not dominate the entire DH because many elements in the DH do not reflect a need to explain defeat and exile: *tôrāh*, dynasty of David, fall of Samaria, and reform of Josiah. Preexilic Judahite scribes in Jerusalem would have had the best position to produce a

⁷⁰ Ibid., 183.

⁷¹ Nelson, “Response to Thomas C. Römer,” 6–9.

⁷² Ibid., 6–7.

narrative history, and thereby a “revolutionary intellectual advance,” as Nelson calls it, because they had the source scrolls in their library.

Römer (2009) acknowledges that the DH uses the anonymous voice of an omniscient narrator, who like a *nābîʾim*, knows the intentions of the omnipotent god.⁷³ DtrP (*nābîʾim*) would have emerged from the class of scribes and high officials modeled after the class of Assyrian *ummiānū* (scholars), who accumulated, recorded, coded, controlled, and published all official written knowledge. Such an imperial scribal school would have created and published the source scrolls of the DH during the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. in Israel and Samaria and Judah and Jerusalem.

In response to Römer, Eckart Otto (2009) agrees that Neo-Assyrian policy influenced Dtr ideology as evidenced by the clear textual connections between Deuteronomy 28 and the vassal treaty of Esarhaddon (VTE).⁷⁴ Otto claims that the Judahite scribes refused to accept the VTE but nonetheless adopted an ideological affinity to it within their sphere of literary independence in what he calls a “subversive reception.”⁷⁵

In her response to Römer's arguments, Yairah Amit (2009) focuses on the book of the *šōpāʾīm* (military commanders; rulers; “Judges”).⁷⁶ According to Amit, the Dtr school of *nābîʾim* wrote the book of *šōpāʾīm* in the late exilic period to fill a gap in the history and to dramatize the inadequate nature of the decentralized pre-Dtr military system. Thus the book of *šōpāʾīm* has a kernel of truth in describing the situation in Samaria before the efforts of the Dtr school at political and cultic centralization. The book depicts legitimate cult sites on the *bāmôt* among families and local communities. The *šōpāʾīm* have direct contact with the local god YHWH and fight in self-defense as needed. They do not need the *nābîʾim* or their authority because like the Canaanites, they have personal contact with their local god, who appoints them in times of emergencies. The *šōpāʾīm* and their people did not endeavor to conquer, to kill, or to enslave their neighbors.

In Amit's view, the Assyrian destruction of Israel and Samaria and Judah and the subjugation and assimilation of Jerusalem had taught the scribal elite of Jerusalem the importance of loyalty to a supreme ruler and god.⁷⁷ The Judahite *nābîʾim* sought to avoid deportation by studying the weaknesses of Samaria and by adapting the local god, YHWH, to the imperial power, and thus their new idea of devotion to YHWH, as a new local imperial power, became predominant.

In his response to Römer's layer model, Steven L. McKenzie (2009) poses the following questions: Where can one find a similar school of scribes like

⁷³ Römer, “Response,” 44–45.

⁷⁴ Otto, “Deuteronomy between the Pentateuch,” 22–27.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Amit, “Book of Judges,” 30–35.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 34–35.

the *nābî'im*? Why set the finding of the law in the Persian period, when it could fit even better in the Jerusalem of the seventh century B.C.E.? Why place the exilic perspective outside the land in Babylon? Why does the DH not mention a specific thing about the Persian period?⁷⁸

1.3. Conclusion

The amount of work done on Noth's DH has complicated the simplicity of his original hypothesis. Instead of a single author (Dtr), the work (DH) has a school of hypothesized authors and editors that consisted of at least DtrG, DtrN, DtrP, DtrB, DtrL, Dtr₁, Dtr₂, and DtrH—of these, DtrG and DtrH would amount to the same author. The Göttingen school continues to atomize the text further. Instead of a unified and coherent history, diverse interests appear to characterize each aspect of the work. Instead of a simple retrospective work done in the exile in Babylon on the *Abfall* and *Verfall* of the people of YHWH and their rulers, the work appears to have originated with the revolutionary reform of Josiah in Jerusalem in the seventh century B.C.E. and made use of some old sources in the Jerusalem temple library that exiles in Babylon would not have had on hand. Instead of advocating a return to pristine, tribal Mosaic and patriarchal values, it may have created a new, imperial relationship with YHWH. Instead of furthering the ideal of the *'āšeret had-dābārîm* and the rule of law, it projects an ideology of military aggression that, under the aegis of YHWH, tramples on the words. Along with the single-author and multiple-redactor model, the layer model suggests that it went through at least three changes in time and place that correspond to its changing authors, concerns, and redactors.

Scholarship, however, has overlooked some important presuppositions of the DH. Scholars agree that disobedience to the law played a major part in the punishment of the people but do not question the nature of the exact "law" (*tôrāh*) or its infraction that caused the death and exile of the nation. Scholarship has accepted the DH assertion that a reform of Josiah challenged the people to intellectual and rational advance and political and cultic centralization, but scholars have not questioned the source or the nature of that so-called advance. Scholars have not questioned the nature, origin, and transformation of a local god in Jerusalem in the seventh century B.C.E., who ordered his followers to conquer and to annihilate, by death or exile, their Canaanite neighbors and their *'ēlōhîm 'āhērîm*. Nor do analyses of the DH question the self-proclaimed authority or the identity of the *nābî'im* as spokespersons for YHWH and as authors and writers of the DH. The most recent studies of Römer, Otto, and others, however, have pointed the way to a possible solution in the larger historical arena of the ancient Near East. This

⁷⁸ McKenzie, "Response to Thomas C. Römer," 18–20.

study will begin with a close reading of the DH as a whole and then propose a historical hypothesis about the origins of these presuppositions in the DH. In finding the answers to these questions, this study will attempt to find some answers to scholarship's ongoing questions about the DH.

CHAPTER 2: DEUTERONOMISTIC COVENANT: A NEW HYPOTHESIS

In order to sort out the issues raised by scholarship concerning the DH, this study proceeds to a close reading of the work as a primary source. The close reading will attempt to locate and to define the motivating principles and presuppositions of the DH.⁷⁹

2.1. *A Declaration of War*

The book of Deuteronomy begins with a declaration of war. YHWH and his *nābî* (spokesperson) Moses declare war on the Canaanites and the Emorites (*hā-ʿēmorî*) and their *ʾēlohîm ʾāḥērîm*. YHWH commands his followers, the people's army, to invade the mountain of the Emorites and the land of the Canaanites (*har hā-ʿēmorî ... ʾereṣ hak-kānaʿānî*; Deut 1:7, 19, 20) and all the surrounding lands, "to take possession of the land that YHWH swore to your fathers" (Deut 1:4–8), and to sanctify it all to the name of YHWH. This opening establishes the primary importance that Dtr attaches to the command to conquer the land and the people residing in it. It ties the impending conquest to an oath sworn to the ancestors and provides a warrant for the land of Canaan on the authority of YHWH. In the forthcoming battle, YHWH leads the way: "YHWH your *ʾēlohîm* is the one going before you. He will fight for you" (Deut 1:30). After listing the lands and peoples already conquered on the way to Canaan, Moses cites YHWH's plan: "to give terror of you and fear of you in the face of the peoples under all of the heavens" (*paḥdākā wə-yirʾātākā ʿal-pānê hā-ʿammîm taḥat kol-haš-šāmāyim*; Deut 2:25).

After the declaration of war and the proclamation of the primary command, Moses opens the *tôrāh* (code of instruction) and uses it to justify the war. The *tôrāh* has two parts: the "ten words on the two tablets of stones" (*ʾāseret had-dəbārîm ʿal-šnê lûḥôt ʾābānîm*; Deuteronomy 4–5) and the larger code of wisdom instruction (the so-called old law code, Deut 4:44–30:20) that Dtr wrote down in the form of a speech and a composition of Moses (Deut 1–4 and 31:1–13). Moses ties the success of the conquest, first, to the observance of the "ten words ... for you to do them in the land to which you cross over to take possession" (Deut 4:13–14). The *ʾāseret had-dəbārîm*, however, prohibit the procedures that a war entails on a large scale: murder, theft, rape, coveting, and desire for one's neighbor's possessions.

The declaration of war and the military command to conquer the land of Canaan and to kill all of its inhabitants, however, overrule the *ʾāseret had-dəbārîm*. The *nābî* Moses then ties success in the war and the settlement of the land, second, to the observance of the larger *tôrāh* code of social, cultic,

⁷⁹ While following the major texts and translations of the primary sources, I attempt my own translations of the Hebrew, Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Northwest Semitic inscriptions. For the Hittite inscriptions, I present the major accepted translations.

and juridical instruction: *wə-zōʾt ham-mišwāh ha-ḥūqqîm wə-ham-mišpāḥîm* ... *laʾššôt bā-ʾāreš* (the commands, the statutes, and the ordinances ... to do in the land) (Deut 6:1). The rhetoric of oath portrays the land of Canaan as a legal gift of YHWH to whom the people will swear their hearts and souls: “You will love YHWH your ʾēlohîm with all your heart and with all your soul ... When YHWH your ʾēlohîm will bring you to the land that he swore to your fathers” (Deut 6:5, 10).

The rhetoric of conquest reaches its climax in the code of instruction when YHWH commands the people concerning the residents in the land of Canaan: “You will annihilate them entirely [*haḥārēm taḥārîm*]. Do not cut a treaty [*bərîr*] with them and do not favor [*təḥānnem*] them” (Deut 7:2–5). In the context of the Deuteronomistic History, the verb *heḥērîm* means “to annihilate” the local populations and “to destroy or to appropriate” their property as sacred to YHWH. The verb *ḥrm* has cognates in Phoenician and Moabite “to consecrate” and in Akkadian *ḥarāmu* “to separate.” It has the basic sense of putting something or someone under a sacred “ban; devoted thing” (*ḥērem*) for consecration to a god by means of total destruction of all people, livestock, and property.⁸⁰ This religious vocabulary equates the conquest of land and mass destruction of people with the consecration of a holy sacrifice to a god and illustrates the deuteronomist’s characteristic use of rhetoric, which mixes cultic and juristic instruction. Dtr then disambiguates the ultimate goal of the war: “YHWH your ʾēlohîm will clear away these nations little by little ... until they are destroyed” (*hiššāmədām*; Deut 7:22–23).⁸¹ YHWH drives the nations out because of their wickedness (*rišʿat*) (Deut 9:4) and to fulfill the oath to the ancestors (Deut 9:5). According to Dtr, their wickedness consists of living on YHWH’s land under the tutelage of ʾēlohîm ʾāḥērîm.

In Deuteronomy’s instructions for the conducting of the war, Moses distinguishes between close towns, which belong to the inheritance, and distant towns, which do not belong. An army may make terms with a compliant distant town or destroy a hostile town and kill its males; it may then help itself to its women and property. As for the local towns, which constitute the inheritance of the people of YHWH, however, the army had to annihilate them entirely (Deut 20:10–18). The *tôrāh* code justifies the conquest of the land, the extermination of its resident population, and the consecration of the land to Dtr’s YHWH as a necessary, sufficient, and legal part of the Dtr covenant.

Outside of this extended justification of the war and the command of YHWH for extermination, the remaining *tôrāh*—such as the ten words that entail observing the Sabbath or the social instruction to protect the rights of widows and orphans (Deut 5:12; 27:19)—plays no role in the ensuing narra-

⁸⁰ HALOT 1:353.

⁸¹ Wiley, “Gather to My Feast.”

tive of the DH. The issues that ensue over the lack of centralization have to do with the implicit need for a central command within an imperial army rather than with the code's rhetoric about cultic centralization. Dtr leads the reader to the book of Joshua where the war begins, and the DH proceeds.

The book of Joshua attests to the importance of the conquest of the land of Canaan and the annihilation of its resident population. The people had to follow the command of YHWH, conquer the land, and annihilate the inhabitants in order to consecrate it to YHWH and thus to create their state. The stories illustrate various military strategies. Joshua sends spies to view the land (Josh 2:1). Miracles, like the rising of the waters of the Jordan to permit the crossing of the army, indicate to the people and to the reader that YHWH leads and accompanies the army of Joshua (Josh 3:16). Accompanied by YHWH, the army proceeds to conquer the land and, in accordance with YHWH's command and legal justification in the *tôrāh*, to "annihilate [*way-yaḥārîmû*] all in the city, men and women, young and old, oxen, sheep, and donkeys by sword-edge" (Josh 6:21). The story of Achan's disobedience emphasizes both the necessity for absolute obedience of the people and the importance of maintaining the justification of holiness and legality of the conquest and extermination (Joshua 7). The story of the Gibeonites illustrates the first breakdown of the command to annihilate a population within an inheritance city and the process of treaty-making (*kārat bərît*) and oath-swearing (*way-yiššābā'u*) with a nation that wishes to submit before Joshua (Josh 9:15). YHWH participates in the battles: "YHWH confused them" (Josh 10:10). The book of Joshua goes on to list the conquered towns, the allotments to the people, and the towns left to conquer (Joshua 12–13). At the end of the book, Dtr reiterates the glories of the conquest (Josh 23:1–5) and warns the people to remain obedient to YHWH in order to avoid incurring his anger.

The theme of the declaration of war continues in the stories of the Judges (*šōpāṭîm*). In these stories the people did not annihilate the resident population and thus did not complete the command or fulfill the covenant of YHWH. Their disobedience and disorganization invites oppression from enemies, and YHWH sends a series of *šōpāṭîm* (military commanders) to set the people right again. The martial spirit of YHWH came upon Othniel, and he conquered Cushan-Rishathaim of Aram (Judg 3:9–10). Later YHWH called up the military commander Ehud, who killed the king of Moab by stealth and thus stopped his aggression (Judg 3:12–30). The *nābî'ā* Deborah became a temporary *šōpēt* and chased the Canaanite commander Sisera into the arms of Yael, who killed him with a tent peg (Judg 4:21). Next the Dtr YHWH called up the reluctant Gideon to take up arms as *šōpēt* against the Midianites, and like Joshua, he accomplished the task with the help of YHWH and a few elite soldiers (Judg 7:7). Jephthah, the mighty *šōpēt*, defeated the Ammonites with the help of an oath to YHWH (Judg 11:1–35). The last of the great *šōpāṭîm* commanders, Samson, had the blessing of YHWH from his youth (Judg 13:24) and used YHWH's favor and supernatural strength to deliver his

people from the Philistines (Judg 16:30). These stories illustrate the military character of Dtr's world and the importance of conquering enemies despite the repeated failures of the people to remain obedient. In the absence of a strong *nābî'* to lead the war, the people acquiesced to their surroundings and forgot about YHWH's aggressive declaration of war.

The rest of the book of *šōpāṭîm* (Judges 18–21) describes the interactions of the decentralized tribes of Israel when "Israel had no king" (*ʔēn melek bə-yiśraʔēl*) (Judg 18:1). The tribes live in the land of Canaan unmolested by their Canaanite neighbors and without plans to exterminate them. According to the chronology of the DH, this section gives the impression that the conquest has succeeded and that the people live in their separate allotments of land and govern themselves. The book concludes with a story about a national war of retribution in which the tribes gather to punish some Benjaminite perpetrators for their crime against a woman. This section does not mention YHWH or the *šōpāṭîm* until the end of the book when the people attribute the breach in relations to YHWH. In a strange and ironic reversal of tribal justice, the people of Israel encourage and allow the Benjaminites to kidnap and to rape with impunity the young women of Shiloh in order to patch up the broken tribal relationships.

The theme of the declaration of war on the Canaanites, the Philistines, and the other nations and their gods comes back into focus in the books of Samuel when the strong *nābî'* (1 Sam 3:20) and *šōpēṭ* (1 Sam 7:15) Samuel steps in to save the errant people from Philistine aggression: "The people of Israel put aside the *bəʿālîm* and the *ʿaštārôt* and served YHWH alone" (1 Sam 7:4). The people had not cleared the land of the *ʔēlōhîm ʿāḥērîm* and their followers suffered aggression because of that failure. Samuel's presence as a *nābî'* military commander brought YHWH into the fight, and they drove away the Philistines.

In the passage that many scholars consider antimonarchical (1 Samuel 8–12), the people tire of YHWH's war and his erstwhile *šōpāṭîm* and make a request to YHWH's authoritative spokesperson, the *nābî'* and *šōpēṭ* Samuel, that he appoint a king (*melek*) like the Canaanite kings around them. The scholar and military commander Samuel warns them about this monarchical institution but consents to appoint a *melek* on the understanding that the king will remain under the authority of YHWH and the *nābî'im*. Later when Saul fails to obey an arbitrary command of Samuel's, he loses his covenantal relationship with YHWH and his ability to command the army and to conquer his enemies (1 Sam 13:13). In that passage Saul waited out the time appointed by Samuel and then, trying to do the right thing, offered a sacrifice without the presence of the *nābî'* Samuel. Later on, Saul disobeyed the command of Samuel and YHWH to annihilate (*haḥāramtem*) the Amalekites and to kill (*hēmatah*) all the living things among them (1 Sam 15:3). In addition to his disobedience, Saul thus violated the holiness of the vengeance extermination and the covenantal nature of the conquest by sparing the king and plundering

the moveable property even though *tôrāh* stipulations for conquest allowed the taking of booty from cities that did not belong to the inheritance (Deut 20:10–18). Samuel accuses Saul, “you rejected the word of YHWH” (*mā’astā ’et-dōbar yhwḥ*; 1 Sam 15:23). By sparing the Amalekites, Saul becomes a paradigmatic figure for the people as a nation, who also lose their state and their lives because they could not annihilate the resident population of Canaanites and Emorites as YHWH had commanded.

David the Bethlehemite, on the other hand, would have no such scruples. Anointed by Samuel and loyal to Dtr’s YHWH, David conquers the enemy and rises to power. At the height of David’s conquests, Nathan (*nātān han-nābî*; 2 Sam 7:2) promises a permanent home for David’s household, as follows:

*wə-neʾman bêtkā û-mamlaktākā ʿad-ʿôlām lə-pānêkā kisʾākā yiḥyeh
nākôn ʿad-ʿôlām*

Your house and your kingdom will be confirmed forever before
you; your throne will be established forever (2 Sam 7:16).

Throughout the rest of the book of Samuel, David carries on YHWH’s war against the other nations in the land of Canaan and continues to survive onslaughts to his power although the narrative becomes focused on the power struggles of the ruling class under David. This part of the narrative reflects the temporary concerns of the local Jerusalemite dynasties where families and shifting loyalties play a part in royal authority. In the encompassing worldview of Dtr, however, dynasty and power depend on the king’s obedience to the *nābîʾîm* and to YHWH in the conduct of the war against the nations.

These local internal power struggles come to a climax under the succession story of David’s favored son Solomon in the books of Kings. According to the story, David and Solomon had won the war, conquered the land, eliminated the other people and *ʿēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm*, and projected their power into a large and peaceful empire: “Judah and Israel were as numerous as the sand of the sea ... Solomon ruled over all the kingdoms from the Euphrates to the land of the Philistines ... they brought tribute and served Solomon all the days of his life” (1 Kgs 4:20). The imperial ambitions and building projects of Solomon of Jerusalem, however, caused problems: “Solomon raised forced labor from all of Israel” (1 Kgs 5:27—Eng 5:13). He engaged in a lifestyle predicated upon victorious conquests and building projects. He took tribute from neighboring kingdoms and raised and transported forced labor from within his own empire. He oppressed the people of Israel, started wars with his neighbors, and tolerated *ʿēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* (1 Kgs 11:14, 23, 33).

Solomon’s imperial and oppressive behavior led Jeroboam to break the kingdom of the *nābîʾîm* and YHWH into two parts and to set up altars to his own local gods in Bethel and Dan: *way-yaʿaś šnê ʿeglê zāhāb way-yōʾmer ... hinnēh ʿēlōhêkā* (He made two calves of gold and said ... here are your gods; 1 Kgs 12:28–29). Even though the text had portrayed the success of David

and Solomon in annihilating the resident population and their gods, the tales of transportation of forced labor within the empire and the persistent presence of *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* in both Jerusalem's ruling class and that of Israel and Samaria suggest that they did not succeed in expunging the tainted populations or their gods from the empire or even the land. The situation reverted again to the previous one of war between Dtr's god and the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm*.

The struggle to reverse the disobedience of Jeroboam and to expel the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm*—the *šnê ʿeglê zāhāb*, the *bəʿalîm*, the *bāmôt*, the *ʾāšērôt*, and the *maššēbôt*—became Dtr's new version of the declaration of war. Cross and others see in this new perspective the hand of the later exilic editor (Dtr₂) but the theme of the conflict between Dtr's YHWH and the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* remains the same. Instead of singling out the indigenous and foreign inhabitants of the land of Canaan, who reject the Dtr national cult and imperial goal, Dtr focuses on their gods, but the same war goes on.

In the end the people lose the war. The unspoken failure of the conquest and the permanent presence of the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* and their followers, even if subjugated, lead to the “apostasy and decay” of the people. Their disobedience to YHWH and the *nābîʾîm* brings about their disaster. In one of the foreshadowing stories, the *nābîʾ* Elijah did not hesitate to slaughter 450 of the *nābîʾê hab-baʿal*: “Elijah said to them, ‘Seize the *nābîʾê hab-baʿal* ... and he killed them there” (1 Kgs 18:40). The final “*Abfall und Verfall*” that brings about the demise of the nation, Jeroboam's sin—on the surface just a violation of a cultic instruction—led Dtr's YHWH to treat his own people as detested followers of *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* and to destroy their presence in the land. The ultimate failure of the nation has at its roots the failure of Joshua and then the people over the course of the centuries of the DH to win the war and to obey the *ḥērem* command of destruction.

The declaration of war, which included the command for the annihilation of the resident population of the mountain of the Emorites and the land of Canaan, juxtaposed with the command for adherence to the *ʿāšeret had-dābārîm ʿal-šnê lūḥôt ʾābānîm* (the ten words on two stone tablets) of social instruction and the *sēper hat-tôrāh*, which provided instructions for the implementation of the annihilation, had put the people of YHWH in an impossible bind—they had to disobey at least one of those two commands. The DH confirms that the people chose not to carry out YHWH's primary command to annihilate the resident populations and their gods even though the *nābîʾîm* and a few kings along the way had held up YHWH's banner and carried on the war. Just as Saul had received disgrace and death for his resistance to Samuel's order to kill Agag the Amalekite, so the people suffered death and exile for their failure to obey YHWH's longterm command to exterminate their neighbors.

Dtr characterizes this defeat as a failure to observe the “law”: *way-yaʿaś šəlōmōh hā-raʿ bə-ʿēnē yhwḥ ... wə-lōʾ šāmartā bərîṭî wə-ḥūqqōtay ... wə-yāḥî had-dābār haz-zeh lə-ḥaṭṭāʾt* (Solomon did evil in the sight of YHWH ...

and you did not keep my covenant and statutes ... And this matter [Jeroboam's] became a crime; 1 Kgs 11:6, 11; 12:30). This simple characterization of the crime conceals four ambiguities in the concept of the law in the DH: (1) the legal declaration of war and the primary command of the supreme authority, YHWH, to annihilate the populations occupying the promised land; (2) the legal, but unenforced, command from the same authority to observe the *ʿāseret had-dabārîm*; (3) the legal exhortation to observe the prescriptions of the *tôrāh* set of social, juridical, and cultic instructions; and (4) the legal requirement under pain of capital punishment to obey the immediate commands of the *nəbîʾîm*. Dtr appears to specify Jeroboam's crime of setting up alternate altars as the ultimate offense, but this offense does not account for the demise of the entire nation.

Dtr's assessment of the people's crime does not account for the irony in the ambiguity of the concept of the law as imperial military command and as a written code of social, juridical, and cultic rules. It conceals the impossible double bind, which required the people to kill their neighbors or to commit treason against YHWH and his *nəbîʾîm*. It hides the irony of YHWH's ultimate act of law enforcement, which brought the people the punishment of death and exile for disobeying a command that required them to annihilate their neighbors. Jeroboam's alleged crime, as a violation of the first word to worship YHWH alone, could not have occurred unless the people had already disobeyed the primary command to kill the inhabitants of the land and to remove their gods.

The condemnation of Saul for sparing Agag the Amalekite provides an example of the military law of the DH from its highest authority. YHWH said to Samuel, "I regret that I made Saul king because he has turned away from me and has not upheld my words" (*niḥamtî kî-himlaktî ʾet-šāʾûl lə-melek kî-šāb mē-ʾaḥāray wə-ʾet-dabāray lōʾ hēqîm*; 1 Sam 15:11). Samuel said to Saul upon condemning him, "Because you have rejected the word of YHWH, he has rejected you from being king" (*yaʿan māʾastā ʾet-dabar yhw̄h way-yimʾāskā mim-melek*; 1 Sam 15:23). Saul had violated the first and most important military command of YHWH: "You shall exterminate them completely" (*haḥārēm taḥārîm ʾōtām*; Deut 7:2).

This analysis thus far permits a tentative hypothesis. The declaration of war by YHWH against the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* and their followers did not cease with the close of the book of Joshua. It carried through the history of the nation and played a major part in the demise of the nation that failed to carry out YHWH's command to exterminate the resident people and their gods.

2.1.1. Scholarship

Scholarship has limited its discussion of the war to the initial conquest. Noth assumed that the people of YHWH had won the war but then collapsed into illegitimate cults.⁸² Davies understood the war as an ideological battle over land ownership in the postexilic situation.⁸³ Lohfink's DtrL (land conquest) stratum limited the war to the conquest of the land of Canaan, the incomplete extermination (*ḥrm*) of the populations, and the appropriation (*yrš*) of the land in Joshua 22.⁸⁴ As Dietrich pointed out, the war instructions in the *sēper hat-tôrāh* (Deut 20:10–18) confirmed the orders for the annihilation.⁸⁵ Weinfeld had attributed the action of *ḥērem* (annihilation) first to the political theory from Samaria and Israel⁸⁶ but elsewhere to other ancient Near Eastern nations (Hittite and Assyrian).⁸⁷ According to Weinfeld, Dtr intended nothing more than literary hyperbole and did not mean to harm the Canaanites. Römer suggests that DtrG (historiographer) invented the conquest tradition in the context of the Neo-Assyrian occupation of Judah.⁸⁸ No scholars suggest that the war went on for the duration of the DH.

2.2. Obedience

Obedience to YHWH and the *nəbî'im* constitutes the second major theme of the DH that this study hypothesizes after that of the war against the *'ēlōhîm 'āḥērîm*. The declaration of war and the command to annihilate the populations contain implicit expectations of military-style obedience. The explicit demand for obedience per se to YHWH and the *nəbî'im* occurs throughout the DH and appears first in the *sēper hat-tôrāh* (Deut 5:6–7): “I am YHWH your *'ēlōhîm* ... you will have no other *'ēlōhîm* over my presence” (*'al pānāya*). It continues with the proclamation in Deut 6:4: “Hear, Israel! YHWH is our *'ēlōhîm*. YHWH alone.” The adjurations to obey commands follow: “to obey the statutes and adjudications ... to obey the commands of YHWH your *'ēlōhîm*” (*šma' 'el-ha-ḥuqqîm wə-'el-ham-mišpāṭîm ... lišmor 'et-mišwôt yhw' 'ēlōhêkem*; Deut 4:1–2).

According to the *sēper hat-tôrāh*, obedience to YHWH's command constitutes the necessary condition for the war and the conquest of the land of Canaan, as the following passage indicates:

⁸² Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 136–40.

⁸³ Davies, “Josiah and the Law Book,” 65–72.

⁸⁴ Lohfink, “Kerygmata,” 87–100.

⁸⁵ Dietrich, “Vielfalt und Einheit,” 171–72.

⁸⁶ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 51–52.

⁸⁷ Idem, “Book of Deuteronomy,” 2.168–83.

⁸⁸ Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 69–71.

*kî 'im-šāmōr tišmārûn 'et-kol-ham-miṣwāh haz-zō't ... lā-ʾahābāh
 'et-yhwh ... wā-hôriš yhwh 'et-kol-hag-gôyim hā-ʾēlleh mil-lipnêkem*
 For if you truly obey all of this command ... to love YHWH ... then
 YHWH will dispossess all the nations from before you (Deut 11:22–
 23).

Loyalty and obedience also determine continued prosperity in the land: “Keep and obey all these words [*šāmōr wā-šāma'tā 'ēt kol-had-dabārîm*] that I command you, so that it will go well with you and your descendants forever” (Deut 12:28). Even the king had to “learn to fear YHWH *'ēlohāyw* to keep all the words of *hat-tôrāh haz-zō'r*” (Deut 17:19). Deuteronomy makes official the appointment of the *nēbî'im* as YHWH’s authoritative spokespersons: “YHWH your *'ēlohîm* will appoint a *nābî'* ... you will obey him [*'ēlāyw tišmā'ûn*]” (Deut 18:15).

In the DH obedience predicates blessings, and disobedience causes curses: “If you will obey [*'im-šāmō'^a*] ... YHWH will make you high above the nations” (Deut 28:1); “If you do not obey [*'im-lo' tišm'^a*] ... then all of these curses will come upon you” (Deut 28:15). The apparent binary simplicity breaks down in face of the multiple nuances of the “words” (*had-dabārîm*) of YHWH that can refer to the *ʾāseret had-dabārîm* (the ten words) on stone; the set of cultic, social, and juridical instructions of the *sēper hat-tôrāh*; the declaration of war and the command for annihilation; or the immediate words of the *nēbî'im*. Despite this ambiguity concerning the content of the words, however, the obedience aspect of the *bārît* of YHWH remains clear: “You stand today all of you before YHWH your *'ēlohîm* ... to cross over into the *bārît* of YHWH your *'ēlohîm* and into his oath [*û-bā-ʾālātô*]” (Deut 29:9–11).

The term loyalty (*ḥesed*) also appears in the context of the first command of the ten words in which YHWH extends reciprocal “loyalty a thousand times to those who love me” (*ḥesed la-ʾālāpîm lā-ʾōhābay*; Deut 5:10). Dtr brings up *ḥesed* again in the context of the extermination of the Emorites of the mountain, which involves “keeping the covenant and the loyalty to those who love him and keep his commands” (*šomēr hab-bārît wā-ha-ḥesed lā-ʾōhābāyw û-lā-šōmārê miṣwôtāw*; Deut 7:9). The *tôrāh* follows that up with a reminder that “when you obey the ordinances” (*ʿēqeb tišmā'ûn 'et ham-miṣpāṭîm*), YHWH will ensure his “covenant and loyalty” (*'et-hab-bārît wā-ʾet-ha-ḥesed*; Deut 7:12).

Beyond the *sēper hat-tôrāh*, Nathan reported “to my servant David” (*'el-ʿabdî 'el-dāwîd*; 2 Sam 7:5) that his loyalty and service to YHWH and the nation, in the form of many such military victories, earned him the *ḥesed* of YHWH forever: “My loyalty will not depart from him” (*wā-ḥasdî lō-yāsûr mim-mennû*; 2 Sam 7:15). Solomon reiterates the covenant of loyalty at his dedication of the temple: “to keep the covenant and the loyalty to your servant” (*šomēr hab-bārît wā-ha-ḥesed la-ʿābādêkā*; 1 Kgs 8:23). Dtr mixes the

rhetoric of reciprocal loyalty and obedience with the rhetoric of cultic instruction, and this literary strategy creates an atmosphere of legality and sacredness around war.

The book of Joshua carries the theme of allegiance and obedience to YHWH forward into the history of the conquest and settlement of the land. As YHWH says to prepare the people for battle in Josh 1:7: “Only be strong and very bold to keep doing according to all of the instruction that Moses my servant commanded you.” The book depicts a binary society consisting of those who obey and those who disobey YHWH and the *nēbî’îm*. The god YHWH speaks to Joshua—“At that time YHWH said to Joshua” (Josh 5:2)—and Joshua listens and obeys. YHWH, on the other hand, led the people’s army around the desert for forty years “until the death of all those men of battle ... who did not obey the voice of YHWH” (*‘ad tōm kol-hag-gōy ‘anšê ham-milḥāmāh ... ‘āšer lō-šāmā’û bə-qōl yhwḥ*; Josh 5:6). The phrase, “YHWH was with Joshua” (Josh 6:27), expresses their close relationship.

The book of Joshua contains lessons concerning the consequences of obedience or disobedience to Dtr’s YHWH. YHWH condemns Achan to death for his crime of disobedience (nonsanctioned theft) during the YHWH-sanctioned killing, plundering, and destruction of the land of Canaan (Josh 7:1–26). Joshua’s obedience, on the other hand, results in military success when YHWH helped out by stopping the sun and the moon. The same pericope illustrates the reciprocal efficacy of Joshua’s covenantal relationship because “YHWH obeyed the voice of a human being” (10:12–13). Caleb received his inheritance in Hebron because of his loyal and trusting obedience to YHWH when others had failed: “But I remained true to YHWH my *‘ēlohîm*” (Josh 14:8).

According to the story, YHWH kept his side of the covenant and “gave to Israel all the land that he had sworn to give to their ancestors” (Josh 21:43). The Reubenites and Gadites avoid a crisis of obedience and covenant allegiance by calling their altar “a witness between us that YHWH is the *‘ēlohîm*” (Josh 22:34). The final speeches of Joshua sum up the covenantal culture of the Deuteronomist. Joshua exhorts the people to love YHWH or to suffer the consequences of losing the land (*wə-nišmartem ... lə’ah”bāh ‘et-yhwḥ*; Josh 23:11–16), and the people agree to the covenant, saying: “We shall serve YHWH, our *‘ēlohîm*, and obey his voice” (Josh 24:24).

The book of “Judges” presents a situation that on the surface appears contrary to that presented in the book of Joshua. The term *šōpəṭîm* refers to the temporary “military commanders” appointed by YHWH to lead the disorganized tribes, who did not complete the conquest or the extermination, in the continuing war with their neighbors. The tribes had no strong leader, and “followed after the *‘ēlohîm ‘āḥērîm* from among the gods of the nations” (*way-yēlakû ‘aḥārê ‘ēlohîm ‘āḥērîm mē-‘ēlohê hā-‘ammîm*; Judg 2:12). The same binary pattern of obedience versus disobedience, however, continues to guide the action. The Joshua account of the conquest, according to Younger, creates a binary universe of YHWH people versus the enemy of various sorts,

who oppose YHWH and threaten the YHWH people.⁸⁹ The people have disobeyed YHWH and thus live in conflict with their hostile neighbors: “They abandoned YHWH and served *baʿal* and the *ʿaštārôt*, and the anger of YHWH burned against them” (Judg 2:13–14). Other people and *ʿēlohîm ʿăḥērîm* remained in the land: “because this people has passed over my *bārîṭ*” (Judg 2:20). A series of *šōpəṭîm* attempts to deal with the situation: “The people of Israel cried out to YHWH, and YHWH raised up for them an anointed one [*môšîʿ*]” (Judg 3:15).

The pattern of reward for obedience and punishment for disobedience to YHWH continues to guide the action in the two books of Samuel. Under the leadership of the *nābîʾ* Samuel, “the people of Israel set aside the *beʿālîm* and the *ʿaštārôt* and served YHWH alone” (*way-yāsîrû bənê yiśrāʾēl ʿet-hab-beʿālîm wə-ʿet-hā-ʿaštārôt way-yaʿabdû ʿet-yhwh ləbadô*; 1 Sam 7:4). The story of Samuel’s appointment of Saul as the king over Israel (1 Samuel 8) indicates Dtr’s hierarchy of authority from YHWH through the *nābîʾ* to the king.

Although Dtr rhetoric demands obedience to the *tôrāh*, the story of Saul’s demise indicates that the king, hence the people, first owed obedience to the immediate commands of the *nābîʾ* as the spokesperson for YHWH. Although having waited out the appointed time for Samuel to offer a sacrifice, Saul went ahead without Samuel, and Samuel thus condemned Saul: “You have been foolish. You did not keep the command of YHWH your *ʿēlohîm*” (1 Sam 13:13). Saul had proceeded to offer a victory sacrifice without Samuel’s presence contrary to Samuel’s immediate instructions but not contrary to a written command (1 Sam 13:13). Later on, Saul did not violate a written covenant of war but rather the immediate and specific vengeful command of Samuel to obliterate the Amalekites and their property. That particular command of Samuel’s contradicted the original version of the conquest plan in the *sēper hat-tôrāh* that permitted the plundering of distant cities but not the extermination of their inhabitants and goods (Deut 20:15; 1 Sam 15:1–22). Samuel condemned Saul nonetheless, as follows:

hinnēh šəmōʿ miz-zebaḥ ṭôb ... yaʿan māʾastā ʿet-dəbar yhwh way-yimʾāsākā mim-melek.

See here, obedience is better than sacrifice. ... Because you have rejected the word of YHWH, he has rejected you from ruling (1 Sam 15:22–23).

David, by contrast, has the quality of obedience that Saul lacked, as the Deuteronomist writes: “and YHWH is with him” (*wa-yhwh ʿimmô*; 1 Sam 16:18). His rise to power depended on his faithful military service to YHWH. In Nathan’s oracle, YHWH promises to reward David, “I shall establish the

⁸⁹ Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 233.

throne of his rule forever ... My loyalty will not depart from him” (*wə-kōnantî ʿet-kissē mamlaktô ʿad-ʿôlām ... wə-ḥasdî lōʾ yāsôr mimmennô*; 2 Sam 7:13–15). Although David often disobeys the stipulations of the *ʿāšeret had-dabārîm ʿal-šnê lûḥôt ʿābānîm* in his treatment of Uriah and others, his loyalty to the supreme authority of the state (YHWH and the *nabîʾîm*) earns YHWH’s protection and reciprocal *ḥesed*. David’s inviolable status exemplifies the overall ambiguity within the DH between the covenant of obedience to authority per se and the contents of the covenant *sēper hat-tôrāh*.

Solomon follows David’s lead in setting up a close covenantal relationship of obedience to YHWH by taking a humble stance and asking for wisdom (1 Kgs 3:9). He confirms this relationship in his speech before the altar of the temple by praising YHWH for as he says: “keeping the covenant (*bərît*) and the loyalty (*ḥesed*) for your servants, who go before you with all their heart” (1 Kgs 8:23). Solomon, however, violated this relationship by following *ʿāštoret ʿēlōhē šidonîn* (Aštoret the *ʿēlōhîm* of the Sidonians) and the *ʿēlōhîm ʿāḥērîm* (1 Kgs 11:33). This violation of Solomon’s and his imperious treatment of Israel and Samaria precipitate the rebellion of Jeroboam and the break-up of the empire and the kingdom.

Jeroboam of Samaria and Israel set up the *šnê ʿeglē zāhāb* (two calves of gold) and the *bāmôt* (places of worship; 1 Kgs 12:25–31), then Rehoboam of Judah set up *bāmôt*, *maššēbôt* (memorial stones) and *ʿāšērîm* (cultic poles; 1 Kgs 14:23). These internal crimes of disobedience brought in a new phase in the DH covenantal relationship with YHWH in which a succession of kings turns away from YHWH and sets up altars for the *ʿēlōhîm ʿāḥērîm*. This crime of sedition against the state dominates the remainder of the DH, which tells of dire punishments for disloyalty and disobedience until the appearance of Josiah and the discovery of the scroll of the *tôrāh* in the temple (2 Kgs 22:8). The *nabîʾ* Huldah plays a key role in reestablishing the king’s covenant relationship with YHWH (2 Kgs 22:14). Despite Josiah’s efforts, however, the people’s crime of disobedience and tolerance of *ʿēlōhîm ʿāḥērîm* and their followers had sealed the fate of the nation. YHWH rejected the states of Israel and Samaria and Judah and Jerusalem: “I shall remove Judah from my presence and reject this city” (*ʿet-yəḥūdāh ʿāsîr meʿal pānay ... û-māʾastî ʿet-hā-ʾîr haz-zîr*; 2 Kgs 23:27). This final passage and its condemnation of the state for its *ʿēlōhîm ʿāḥērîm* has literary resonance with YHWH’s initial command in the *sēper hat-tôrāh*: “I am YHWH your *ʿēlōhîm* ... you will have no *ʿēlōhîm ʿāḥērîm* in my presence [*ʿal pānāya*]” (Deut 5:6–7).

This summary of the theme of obedience in the DH illustrates a second significant component of the covenant. It does not hinge upon the social, cultic, or juridical content of the *sēper hat-tôrāh* or the “ten words on stone,” as the DH claims and as scholars call “law.” The covenant does not depend upon whether the people respect their parents, or observe the Sabbath in Jerusalem or anywhere, or even whether or not they bring in *ʿēlōhîm ʿāḥērîm* as Dtr claims. The *ʿēlōhîm ʿāḥērîm* never left. Dtr’s late rhetoric about the

ʿēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm constitutes a euphemism for or a symptom of the failure to win the war and to annihilate the populations one way or another. The people and the state had failed to obey YHWH's declaration of war on the land of Canaan, its Canaanites, Emorites, all of its other populations, and the ʿēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm. They had failed in the first place to sanctify it to YHWH. The state failed because it disobeyed the most important command of its highest military authority (YHWH and *mōšeh han-nābî*) and did not complete the conquest as planned.

This command, and the declaration of war, constituted the “law” that YHWH and the *nābî'im* enforced throughout the DH. YHWH's command to Joshua to conquer and to annihilate the land of the Canaanites and the mountain of the Emorites overrides the “ten words on two stone tablets” (*ʿāšeret had-dabārîm ʿal-šnê lûḥôt ʾābānîm*) that prohibit such actions. Jephthah's oath to YHWH to sacrifice the first person he meets for the purpose of conquering enemies overrides the ten words not to murder. Saul alienates YHWH not because he obeyed the original conquest stipulation to take plunder from a distant town of Amalekites but because he disobeyed the more immediate command of the *nābî* Samuel to destroy the town and to spare no one. David attains protection for his numerous offenses against the *ʿāšeret had-dabārîm* because he carries on the war and maintains the proper attitude of obedience to YHWH. Even YHWH violates the instruction not to murder when he sacrifices the child of David and Bathsheba to protect his obedient and indemnified servant from punishment for their adultery and the murder of Bathsheba's husband. The primary command of YHWH and the immediate commands (*dabārîm*) of the *nābî'im* to advance the war on the local populations take precedence over both the ten words on stone from Horeb and the extended code of social, juridical, and cultic instructions of the *sēper hat-tôrah*.

2.2.1. Scholarship

Obedience per se constitutes a major factor in the covenant with YHWH as several scholars have noted. According to Veijola, each of the hypothesized redactors of the DH—DtrG, DtrP, DtrN—judges David, the eternal dynasty, and the subsequent kings according to their obedience to the *nēbî'im*.⁹⁰ DtrH considered David an obedient servant of YHWH and the *nēbî'im*. DtrP (*nēbî'im*) subordinated the kings to the *nēbî'im* and, according to Veijola, considered the kings guilty and bad. DtrN (*tôrah*) compromised and considered king David acceptable because he obeyed the law but considered other monarchs (except Hezekiah and Josiah) unacceptable because they did not obey YHWH, the law, or the *nēbî'im*. Thus, according to Veijola, the promise of an eternal dynasty has validity if the dynasty obeys YHWH and the *nēbî'im* in perpetuity.

⁹⁰ Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie*, 127.

The unified theological message of the DH lies in the obedience to the law of Moses in Deuteronomy, according to Mayes, and he points to the incident of Achan as an example (Joshua 7) where Achan committed a violation of the war law (Deut 20:10–18).⁹¹ In the view of this study, however, Achan's taking of plunder did not violate the so-called war law of Deuteronomy 20, but Joshua changed the law just before the battle of Jericho and commanded the army to bring the plundered goods to YHWH. The Achan story illustrates one of many incidents in which immediate obedience to YHWH's authoritative representatives overrides the *sēper hat-tôrāh*.

According to Weinfeld, YHWH granted David a dynasty forever because of his obedience (2 Sam 7:13, 16; 23:5).⁹² Weinfeld, however, translates Nathan's promise to David as an "eternal, unconditional kingship" while the text does not use those words, as the following passage indicates:

*wā-ne'man bêtākā û-mamlaktākā 'ad-ʿôlām lā-pānêkā kis'ākā yihyeh
nākôn 'ad-ʿôlām*
Your house and your kingdom will be confirmed forever before
you. Your throne will be established forever (2 Sam 7:16).⁹³

The text says nothing about either "unconditional" or "kingship." The expression *'ad-ʿôlām* would not imply a certain future temporal eternity, since the class of *nābî'im* did not include soothsayers and diviners. The translation of *nābî'* into "prophet" as one who delivers ambiguous oracles from the gods about the future reflects later interpretation from the Greek world of προφήτης. The expression *lā-pānêkā* "before you; in/to/for your presence" adds to the ambiguity of the promise. The *wā-qāṭal* imperfective form of the expression *wā-ne'man* followed by the imperfective *yihyeh* *nākôn* may indicate a modal imperfective wish rather than a future certainty.⁹⁴ Further, interpreting *mamlaktākā* "your kingdom" as "your kingship" changes the meaning of the term to focus on the person of the king and indicates an ideological hermeneutic on the part of the translators. Even if Dtr intended to mean "kingship," such a private patrimonial institution would play a separate role outside of the imperial and administrative institution of the covenant of obedience.

Yet Cross and von Rad have created out of this passage a dichotomy of conditional versus unconditional covenants that does not fit within the larger DH work.⁹⁵ At best, this promise to David, because of his obedience, serves to contextualize local Canaanite dynastic interests within the larger context

⁹¹ Mayes, *Story of Israel*, 4–6.

⁹² Weinfeld, "Deuteronomy," 2.168–83.

⁹³ Idem, "בְּרִית," 227.

⁹⁴ Gesenius, § 107a.

⁹⁵ Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 278–82; Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 306–11.

of the imperial ideology of the DH as a whole. The “eternal and unconditional” promise to David’s house breaks down within his lifetime when the *nābî* Nathan puts his descendants under a curse, and YHWH kills his first-born son (2 Sam 12:10, 15).

The exhortations to loyalty and the oath of obedience in Deuteronomy resemble in form and style those of the political treaties of the Hittites and the Assyrians, according to Weinfeld. He cites Mendenhall’s (1954) comparison of the biblical covenant with the structure of the Hittite treaties: (1) titulature, (2) historical introduction as motivation for vassal’s loyalty, (3) stipulations, (4) divine witnesses, (5) blessings and curses, and (6) recital and deposit. He shows that the Sinai covenant narrative has a similar, but not identical, structure: (1) historical introduction to the source of grace and election, (2) law, (3) promises and threats, and (4) ceremony and recital.⁹⁶ Deuteronomy abounds with terms—such as, “hearken, be perfect, go after, serve, fear, put words in one’s heart, not turn to right or left”—that come from the contemporaneous Assyrian vassal treaty of Esarhaddon (VTE). The Hittite overlord demands that his subjects serve him with their armies, horses, chariots, with their heart or soul, and that they love the suzerain as they love themselves. Weinfeld’s analysis emphasizes the central role of the oath of obedience in the covenant to YHWH and its precedent in imperial covenant culture.

According to McKenzie, the so-called antimonarchic passage of 1 Samuel 8–12 does not condemn the monarchy per se because the people’s obedience to YHWH remains the primary concern of the DH.⁹⁷ The present study agrees that the text calls the people to choose obedience to YHWH, and YHWH’s manifestation of power warns the people of the consequences of disobedience (1 Samuel 12). Dtr condemns disobedient monarchs but approves of obedient monarchs, who followed the *nābî* Moses *‘ebed yhwh* (servant of YHWH) in pursuing the war.

Dietrich points out that the DtrP (*nābî’îm*) source emphasizes abject obedience to YHWH.⁹⁸ Even the *’iš ’ēlōhîm* (man of god), who came from Judah to oppose Jeroboam at his new altar (1 Kings 13), dies for his trivial disobedience to YHWH’s travel instructions.⁹⁹

According to Thomas Römer, the theme of obedience to YHWH plays a major role in the narrative of 1 Kings 15–2 Kings 17.¹⁰⁰ This narrative evaluates the kings according to their obedience to the command of cultic centralization. Written in the Neo-Assyrian period of Josiah, it has much in common with the contemporaneous vassal treaty of Esarhaddon (VTE),

⁹⁶ Weinfeld, “בְּרִית,” 266.

⁹⁷ McKenzie, “Trouble with Kingship,” 286–314.

⁹⁸ Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 102.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 122–25.

¹⁰⁰ Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 10.

which demands absolute loyalty and submission under threat of death.¹⁰¹ The VTE stipulations insist on love for Aššurbanipal and the necessity to keep the “words”: “You shall love Aššurbanipal ... king of Assyria, your lord, as yourself. You shall not seek any other king or lord against him.” The stipulations resemble those of Deut 6:4: “You shall love YHWH your god with all your heart ... keep these words!”

The present study sees Dtr’s evaluation as one of obedience rather than as a judgment concerning cultic centralization because imperial centralization of command and authority entail cultic centralization. A demand for cultic centralization functions as a metonymy, or at least a symptom, of the larger issue of central military command. Like the cultic instructions in the *sēper hat-tôrāh*, the content of the instruction takes second place to the necessity for unquestioning obedience to the commands of the supreme authority of YHWH and the *nabî’im*.

The central necessity of obedience in the covenant derives from the Neo-Assyrian tradition of the loyalty oath, according to Eckart Otto.¹⁰² Otto hypothesizes that the Deuteronomist derives the theme of “love” (*yd*; or “to know”) from Assyrian *rāmu* (love), which indicates the concept of political loyalty and allegiance to an imperial king. As Otto sees the process, the Deuteronomists took over the Assyrian stipulation for absolute allegiance and replaced the Assyrian king with YHWH. The Deuteronomist thus used Judahite terminology to define a concept of religious treason as the breaking of an oath of obedience.¹⁰³ Deuteronomy 13 frames the loss of allegiance according to the Assyrian *srh* (treason) and the punishment as *ndh* (*wā-hiddāh*, “drive out; banish; exile”; 2 Sam 15:14).

These scholars—Veijola, Mayes, Weinfeld, McKenzie, Deitrich, Römer, and Otto—confirm the importance of obedience per se as an element of the covenant between YHWH and the people. Like Römer, Otto points the analysis in the direction that this present study will pursue, and this study will return to these scholars in the last chapter.

Although having reached a consensus about the importance of obedience to Dtr’s covenant, scholars do not specify which law Dtr’s YHWH required the people to obey. Scholars also agree about the importance of the law to the covenant but do not discuss what constitutes a law and which law the people broke to deserve death and exile. So far this study has observed a contrast between the declaration of war and the primary command of YHWH to conquer and to clear the land versus the command to observe the *‘āseret had-dabārîm* *‘al-šnê lūhôt ‘ābānîm* and the *sēper hat-tôrāh* book of social, cultic, and juridical instructions, which includes passages of support for the war. This study has further observed the ambiguity between the written un-

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 74–75.

¹⁰² Otto, “Die Ursprünge,” 35.

¹⁰³ Moran, “Ancient Near Eastern Background.”

enforced *tôrāh* and the spoken enforced commands of the *nəbî'im* and YHWH.

2.3. Capital Punishment and Law Enforcement

Capital punishment for disobedience forms the third component in the political, religious, and legal ideology of the DH. Did YHWH punish the kings and the people over infractions of the *tôrāh* or for disobedience to his military commands delivered through the *nəbî'im*? Which one of those two sets of commands serves as the actual law of YHWH that YHWH enforces with the punishment of death and exile?

In the introductory speech of Deuteronomy, the people have lost trust in YHWH to bring them into the land of Canaan, and YHWH responds with anger, as follows:

*Way-yiqšōp way-yiššāba' lē'mōr 'im yir'eh 'iš bā-'ānāšim hā-'ēlleh
had-dōr hā-rā' haz-zeh 'et hā-'āreš hat-ṭōbāh 'āšer nišba'fī lā-tēt la-
'ābōtēkem. ... wat-tamrū 'et-pī yhwh*

He was angry and swore, “No man among this bad generation will see the good land that I swore to your fathers. ... You rebelled against the command of YHWH” (Deut 1:35, 43).

Not even Moses, the greatest of the *nəbî'im*, escapes the angry death sentence of YHWH, as follows: *ū-mūt bā-hār 'āšer 'attāh 'ōleh šāmmāh ... 'al 'āšer mə'altem bī* “You will die there on the mountain that you climb ... because you acted unfaithfully with me” (Deut 32:50–51).

In the *sēper hat-tôrāh*, Moses warns the people not to forget the *bərīt* because “YHWH your *'ēlohîm* is a consuming fire, a jealous *'ēl* ... YHWH will scatter you among the peoples” (Deut 4:24–27). Moses warns the people about *'ēlohîm 'āḥērîm*: “lest the anger of YHWH burn against you, and he destroy you from the face of the land” (*wə-hišmīdākā mē'al pənē hā-'ādāmāh* Deut 6:14–15). Unless they conquer the mountain of the Emorites and the land of Canaan, annihilate all the inhabitants, and destroy all their possessions, YHWH will get angry and destroy his own people (Deut 7:2–5). They had to launch an unprovoked attack on a wicked (*riš'at*; Deut 9:4) and abhorrent (*tô'ābat*; Deut 7:25) population and kill them all. After the people's failure to exterminate these nations and their *'ēlohîm 'āḥērîm*, YHWH carried out his threat of capital punishment in the end and destroyed the nation: “Even more so YHWH did not relent from his great anger” (*'ak lo'-šāb yhwh mē-ḥārôn 'appô hag-gādōl*; 2 Kgs 23:26).

The *sēper hat-tôrāh* presents a long list of the capital punishments for disobedience (Deut 28:15–68). To round out the covenant, YHWH makes repeated threats of death just for talking about *'ēlohîm 'āḥērîm*: “You will kill him ... put him to death ... Stone him so that he dies ... Let nothing from

the extermination stick to your hand” (*hārog tahargennû ... la-hāmîto ... û-səqaltô bā-ābānîm wā-mēt ... wə-lōʾ-yidbaq bə-yādəkā məʾûmāh min-ha-ḥērem*; Deut 13:10, 11, 18). Although YHWH had promised a peaceful land of holiness and obedience to the law, in reality he proposes a dialectical paradox and an impossible bind. The people had to obey YHWH’s command to annihilate an innocent population or suffer the punishment of death and exile.

2.3.1. Scholarship

Weinfeld explains capital punishment as “self-condemnation [for] violation of the oath” (Deut 29:21–24).¹⁰⁴ In his view the people lost the land as a punishment for idolatry as the *sēper hat-tôrāh* had warned: “If you serve ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm ... YHWH’s anger will flame up against you” (Deut 11:16–17). In the view of this study, however, Weinfeld does not see behind Dtr’s rhetoric or account for the real cause of the capital punishment. The people failed to obey the command to exterminate the Canaanites who own the ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm.

Cross analyzes the various idioms concerning the theme of punishment for disobedience or disloyalty from both the Levantine world of the second millennium B.C.E. and the first millennium B.C.E. area influenced by the Assyrian empire. The Amorite idiom from Mari, to make a covenant meant to kill a young donkey (*ḥayarum qaṭālum*) and referred to the ceremony that established an agreement between two groups beyond a kinship relationship.¹⁰⁵ According to Cross, it parallels the Hebrew idiom *krt bryt* (to cut a treaty). The Aramaic inscription of Sefire uses the expression, *gazar ʿādayya* (to cut/decreed a treaty) accompanied by the threat, “Just as this calf is cut up, so may Matīʿil be cut up.” The Assyrian king Aššurnirari V (755–746 B.C.E.) makes a similar treaty with Matīʿil. The common threat of capital punishment lay behind treaties that required the cutting up of an animal. In the view of this study, however, the difference between Levantine and Assyrian treaties lies in the balance of power and in the purpose. Levantine treaties between cities of equal strength made a trade or defense contract after which they slaughtered an animal and feasted together. The Assyrian imperial treaties, on the other hand, reflect Dtr’s unilateral threat of the superior military power to punish the disobedient party with total demolition.

¹⁰⁴ Weinfeld. “Book of Deuteronomy” 2:180.

¹⁰⁵ Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 266.

2.4. *Hypotheses*

On the basis of the scholarship and the close reading of the DH, this study proposes tentative hypotheses concerning the elements of the Dtr covenant, the presuppositions of the DH, the law, the authors, the dates, and YHWH. The chapter will finish with the plan of the present work to analyze each of these issues in their historical context.

2.4.1. Elements of the Dtr Covenant

Dtr's revolutionary new imperial military covenant thus consists of the following principal elements: (1) the declaration of war and the command to conquer the land of Canaan, to annihilate its resident population, and thus to consecrate the land to YHWH; (2) obedience to the orders of YHWH and his *nəbî'im*; (3) enforcement by capital punishment or exile (national death) for failure to obey the command, hence the law, of YHWH and his *nəbî'im*; (4) the presupposition of a god with supreme universal authority over nations and lands; and (5) the presupposition of a powerful and large military organization under the command of the self-appointed *nəbî'im*.

2.4.2. Presuppositions of the DH

The DH presupposes the presence of YHWH as a supreme military commander, who commands the king, the army, and the society by means of Moses, the first and greatest *nābî'*, and then the subsequent *nəbî'im*. It presupposes an imperial agenda that justifies the projection of military power into a foreign land under the claim of inheritance by legal conquest and divine command. It presupposes that the military commander has universal jurisdiction and that his orders carry the force of international law enforceable by capital punishment. It presupposes the validity of the legal warrant of YHWH to the land of Canaan and does not question the source of YHWH's authority or the precedent in history for such a command. It presupposes an imperial military- and bureaucratic-style relationship between YHWH as imperial power and the people as subjects and soldiers, who need to swear an oath of obedience.

2.4.3. Law

By the term "law," this study refers to official public policy enforced by the state rather than to a code of social, cultic, and juridical rules that it does not enforce. As R. M. Dworkin writes concerning the positivist definition of law:

The law of a community is the set of special rules used by the community directly or indirectly for the purpose of determining which behaviour will be punished or coerced by the public power.

These special rules can be indentified and distinguished by specific criteria ... to distinguish valid legal rules from spurious legal rules and from other sorts of social rules that the community follows but does not enforce through public power. ... To say that someone has a “legal obligation” is to say that his case falls under a valid legal rule that requires him to do or to forbear from doing something. ... Austin, for example, ... defined having an obligation as lying under a rule, a rule as a general command, ... backed by the power and will to enforce that expression in the event of disobedience. ... The legal rules of a community are the general commands its sovereign has deployed. Austin’s definition of legal obligation followed from this definition of law. One has a legal obligation, if one is among the addressees of some general order of the sovereign, and is in danger of suffering a sanction unless he obeys that order. ... Austin’s model is quite beautiful in its simplicity ... It asserts the first tenet of positivism, that the law is a set of rules specially selected to govern public order, and offers a simple factual test—what has the sovereign commanded?—as the sole criterion for identifying those special rules.¹⁰⁶

This study follows Dworkin’s definition and distinguishes between the code of social, cultic, and juridical rules of the *sēper hat-tôrāh*, which do not constitute law per se, and the law of the military command of YHWH and the *nābî’ mōšeh* as presented in the DH. YHWH enforced two laws in the covenant with the people: (1) to conquer and to sanctify the mountain of the Emorites (*har hā’ēmōrî*; Deut 1:7) and the land of Canaan (*’ereṣ kəna’an*; Deut 32:49) to the name of YHWH; and (2) to obey the commands of YHWH’s spokesperson, the *nābî’* Moses, and the immediate commands of the *nābî’im* as the direct representatives of YHWH.

The *’āšeret had-dəbārîm* *’al-šnê lūḥôt ’ābānîm* and the *sēper hat-tôrāh* derive what authority they have from the spoken command of YHWH and Moses to follow them. Thus, according to the internal logic and evidence within the DH, a spoken command of YHWH, or Moses, or any subsequent *nābî’* constitutes the ultimate and primary source of authority and law in the state. The command to exterminate the Canaanites and Emorites, therefore, takes precedence over a secondary written command to avoid the *’ēlōhîm ’āḥērîm*. In the end Dtr reports that YHWH punished the people for their rejection of a centralized cult and their attention to *’ēlōhîm ’āḥērîm*, but these two issues constitute symptoms of the deeper and more serious offense of continual disobedience to the supreme military authority that commanded their destruction in the first place as a condition for the settlement.

¹⁰⁶ Dworkin, “Is Law a System of Rules?” 38.

Military law and obedience to orders thus lie at the foundation of the imperial covenant between YHWH and the people. The covenant has an imperial nature because it involves the projection of the military power of YHWH into a land settled by other nations but claimed by YHWH through a legal right of conquest. The legal right of conquest derives from its self-proclaimed warrant by divine right and from the ability of an army to defeat and to exterminate the population either by killing or by deportation. The covenant relationship derives an additional military aspect from its warrant for justified killing under the command of a central military authority under the auspices of a single god. The relationship focuses on the necessity for immediate and implicit obedience to orders from commanders. Those who disobey orders incur immediate and justified capital punishment under the rules of engagement.

2.4.4. *Nəbîʾîm*

The Dtr school itself consisted of a class of *nəbîʾîm*, who as the scholars of the realm made up the literate administrative class, advised the court, and kept the records. They had privileged access to inside information and knew the intentions of YHWH because they wrote the history that defined the role of YHWH. The ideology of the *nəbîʾîm* presupposed an informed and imperial cultural infrastructure, which they adapted and wrote into the social, religious, and political infrastructure of the DH and, hence, into their covenant with YHWH. Their *vaticinium ex eventu* predictions (written in the seventh cent. B.C.E., or later, about events that might have occurred hundreds of years earlier) emerged from their positions of power, influence, and knowledge as authors of the mind of YHWH, whom they established in the DH as the ultimate and supreme authority of the state. The author creates the world of the work. The term—*nəbîʾîm*, *nəbîʾ*—does not correspond to the anachronistic, conventional, and misleading Greek term *προφήτης*, which presupposes divination and soothsaying.

This imperial military Dtr covenant has much in common with Neo-Assyrian imperial ideology as several scholars of the DH have pointed out. The scribes of Jerusalem lived under the political, religious, and ideological domination of the Assyrian empire for about 245 years from the first conquest, deportation, and exile of Samaria and Israel by Tiglath-pileser III in 732 B.C.E., through the final destruction of that city and kingdom in 721 B.C.E. by Sargon II, through the destruction and deportation of Judah by Sennacherib in 701 B.C.E., until the final destruction of the city of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 587 B.C.E. As this study has suggested in the previous chapter, the scribes and scholars of Jerusalem of the seventh century B.C.E. had the opportunity to learn about the mechanics of imperial power from the Assyrians. They had the means, the library, and the motive to compose the DH for the purpose of creating an ideological power source for their eventual rebellion against the empire. The DH promotes this ideology of an imperial

power conquering Canaan, removing the nations, and establishing its own empire.

2.4.5. Chronology and Context

Dtr's imperial military covenant fits well into the scenario of an educated Jerusalem elite in a small capital city surrounded by deportees from across the Assyrian empire in the seventh century B.C.E. The survivors resisted the Assyrians and the deportees but adapted and adopted their imperial ideology as a means of projecting power and of conquering territory back from the foreign deportees in the land of Canaan. Hence, they declared war on the "nations," which included their fellow Canaanites, who continued to follow the local *ʾēlōhîm* and the *ʾēlōhîm* of the deportees (all the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm*). The revolutionary new system required a central military authority identified with a single *ʾēlōhîm* and a centralized cult and religion that would captivate the hearts and minds of the soldiers. Thus the authors and editors of the Dtr school (the *nabîʾîm*) condemned the kings and their own fellow citizens who did not adhere to the new imperial *ʾēlōhîm*.

This hypothesis would explain the sense of exile and alienation in Jerusalem among the Dtr school of authors surrounded by refugees from Samaria and Israel and deportees from the empire. The first exile, which this study proposes to call Exile₁ (corresponding to Dtr₁, preexilic) began with Tiglath-pileser III's conquest of Samaria in 732 B.C.E. and continued throughout the 245 years until the second exile, Exile₂ (corresponding to Dtr₂, exilic), to Babylonia in 587 B.C.E. During Exile₁, the Dtr school would have maintained hope for their new god and new system but, in the face of Exile₂, laid blame on the defectors. This hypothesis thus suggests that, except for the final chapters at the end of the DH that describe the final demise of the state and the exile to Babylon (Exile₂), a Babylonian "exilic" composition of the DH appears implausible. The overwhelming military imperial viewpoint of the Dtr covenant makes sense in the period of Exile₁ during which the *nabîʾîm* might have dreamt of retaking the land by force.

Except for its affirmation of the extermination and its instructions for war (Deuteronomy 7 and 20), the *sēper hat-tôrāh* and DtrN (*tôrāh*)'s exhortations to follow it might have constituted later additions to the DH by the editors of Exile₂ in Babylonia. Such an aggressive policy, however, would not fit with that situation. The aggressive and revolutionary authors of Exile₁ in Jerusalem would have had access to the Assyrian and Babylonian literature that included their codes of instruction and would have included the *ʾāšeret had-dabārîm*, from the local Moses tradition, and the *sēper hat-tôrāh* as moral justification for their policy.

The succession narratives of Saul, David, and Solomon would reflect the concerns of the remnant Jerusalem ruling class about royal dynasties. Yet the

overall context of the DH makes clear that the kings held power in the new religious and political system under YHWH and the *nābî'im*.

During the period of Exile₁, the Dtr authors would have attempted to emphasize the necessity of unified loyalty and obedience to YHWH and the *nābî'im* as a matter of self-defense and in order to assert their renewed authority over the land of Canaan.

Dtr's historical depiction of Exile₂ (the Babylonian exile; 2 Kings 23–25) highlights the guilt felt by the authors over the unforgiven crime that brought about the final disaster. What Dtr describes as disloyalty to law refers to the symptom of the real offense of the people against YHWH in the form of their disobedience to the command of YHWH and the *nēbî'im*.

2.4.6. Universal Omnipotent God

The DH conveys a strong sense of irony in the rebellious effort of the Dtr *nābî'im* to create a revolutionary new state. The reformation of religion and politics that constituted the new state and shaped their rebellion against the empire consisted of that empire's values, which they had adapted to their local situation. Although scholars recognize the transformation in the theology of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E., they have not questioned the transformation of a local Jerusalem god into a new omnipotent Dtr god with universal jurisdiction.

2.5. *Plan of the Present Work*

The following study will attempt to locate the origin and the historical precedent of the Dtr covenant. It will focus, first, on the Levant as the natural ground for it to grow because the DH itself claims to have grown up from tribal roots into an empire in the Levant. It will turn, second, to the imperial background of the Hittites because of Mendenhall's important determination of common traits that it shares with the subjugation treaties of the empire of Hattuša. Following the clues laid out by several DH scholars, the study will turn, third, to the empire of Assyria in the first millennium B.C.E. After studying the important characteristics of the Assyrian imperial policies and ideology, the study will turn, fourth, to the small states of the Levant under the influence of the Assyrian empire during the ninth to seventh centuries B.C.E. to see how they reacted to its power and influence. In the effort to locate the Dtr covenant in history, this study will examine the social, political, and religious presuppositions that lie behind the extant literatures and ideologies of the close predecessors and contemporaries of Dtr. Each chapter will begin thus with a survey of the scholarship concerning the society involved so that the study can then analyze the extant works on their own terms within their own context. Each chapter will then end with a brief comparison of that society and its works with the present hypothesis of the Dtr covenant. The final

chapter will consist of an extended comparison between the Dtr covenant and the imperial ideology of Assyria.

CHAPTER 3: DEUTERONOMISTIC COVENANT AND THE LEVANT

Could the deuteronomistic covenant have developed from the common Levantine culture of Jerusalem? The DH depicts the people's past in the land of Canaan, the exile in Egypt, and the return in force: "For ask about the first days that came before you, ... as YHWH your *'ēlohîm* ... brought you in his presence by his great power out of Egypt" (Deut 4:32–37). From the tribal beginnings in the hills of Judah, the nation and the empire grow, decay, and suffer exile within a few generations. In the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E., according to the DH and to modern scholars, the Dtr scribes of Judah experience a great intellectual leap forward as expressed in the advanced concept of centralization of cult and government.¹⁰⁷

This chapter will present a much broader view of that history from outside the controlled world of the DH. It will begin with a review of the evidence linking Jerusalem, first, to its ambient Levantine culture and, second, to the Levantine city of Ugarit from the late second millennium. Each city of the Levant had its own gods, myths, and ruling class, but this particular distinction in itself points to the common social and political structures that emerged among the small cities inhabiting the mountainous geographical area on the eastern littoral of the Mediterranean. Ugarit produced a large corpus of literature on clay tablets, and this evidence, while limited to a single city, has significant points in common with limited evidence from other centers of Levantine culture. During the second millennium B.C.E., Ugarit thrived within the orbit of the Hittite empire while Jerusalem lived under the power of Egypt as part of the historical, political region known as Canaan.

3.1. *Survey of the Scholarship*

Othmar Keel provides a comprehensive survey of Jerusalem's situation during the Amarna age and the early first millennium B.C.E. 'Abdi Ḥeba, known to Pharaoh as the *ḥazannu* "city governor" of Jerusalem, referred to himself as a "soldier, friend of Pharaoh," and put the interests of the property, land, and power of Pharaoh above the interests of his fellow Canaanite *šarrū* "kings." Jerusalem had a nonroyal court with a palace (however small), scribes, and a garrison that controlled the trade routes to the coast. The theophoric element in the name Jerusalem suggests a connection to the god Šalem, who appears in Ugarit as one of the twin sons of 'Ilu and 'Athiratu. The name 'Abdi Ḥeba suggests a remote connection to the Hittite goddess Ḥeba, who had associations with both 'Athiratu of Ugarit and Tešub of Ḥattuša. The cities of the Levant during the Amarna and Late Bronze age participated in the business network and the symbol systems of both Egypt and north Syria. The Egyp-

¹⁰⁷ Coogan, *Oxford History*.

tian institutional sun cult, Amun Re^c “sun god, creator, world-god” (^dUTU), dominated the symbol system of Jerusalem while the Hittite and north Syria cult of the weather-god (^dIM; Hadad, Ba^clu) enriched it. In Ugarit Baalsepos celebrated Ba^clu as the “king of the gods.”¹⁰⁸ Keel’s evidence thus suggests that by the beginning of the first millennium B.C.E., Jerusalem and Ugarit shared a common Levantine culture while accommodating the dominant culture of the surrounding empires.

Yet the situation changed by the beginning of the tenth century B.C.E. According to Keel, who follows here the secondary, seventh-century-B.C.E. source DtrG, this change took place as a result of the conquest of Jerusalem by the biblical character David. Archaeology of this period turns up Cypro-Phoenician pottery, Proto-Aeolian architecture, inscriptions with Phoenician writing, and fortresses along the trade routes of the Phoenician-Greek-Mediterranean trade network. In the ninth century B.C.E., inscriptions with the name of *yhw*, *yaho*, *yw*, and *yhwh*, associated with the Shasu and Arab people of Edom, Midian, and north Arabia, appear in Kuntillet ‘Ajrud (*yhwh šmrn*, *yhwh tmn*), south Judah, and Moab along the trade routes between Arabia and the Mediterranean. Although Keel associates the name *yhwh* with war and with David’s conquest of Jerusalem, the traditions associated with David—ark narrative, rise of David, succession narrative, altar of Arauna—presuppose a covenantal relationship with a war-god that does not fit into the pre-Assyrian Canaanite world of Jerusalem.¹⁰⁹ The archaeological evidence points to a Jerusalem that participated, first, in the Egyptian and Hittite empire trade and culture networks of the second millennium and then in the Phoenician-Greek-Mediterranean network of the early first millennium. In both cases the city retained its native Levantine Phoenician-Canaanite character as evidenced by the presence of the common gods ʾIlu/ʾEl, Baʿal, ʿAnat, ʾAthiratu, Ašerah, Šalem, along with the imperial gods Heba, the sun god ^dUTU, and the weather god ^dIM Hadad.

Thus this present study will treat Jerusalem and Ugarit of the late second millennium B.C.E. as representative of a larger and common Levantine culture. The cities of the Levant had many characteristics in common despite their local variations and their differing relationships with the great empires.

A representative survey of the scholarship provides evidence that Jerusalem, Ugarit, and the other city-states of the Levant shared a common array of gods both local and imperial as well as a common territorial, business, and cultural network. The Levant includes the coastal lands, cities, and adjacent areas of the eastern Mediterranean littoral: Canaan/Phoenicia, Syria-Palestine including Jerusalem, Ugarit, and Amurru.¹¹⁰ In the Levant, the city-

¹⁰⁸ Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems*, 106–31.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 147–337.

¹¹⁰ Schmitz, “Canaan,” 1.828–30.

state and its surrounding territory constituted the basic political unit.¹¹¹ During the mid-second millennium, Jerusalem had belonged to the Canaanite Amarna culture under the influence of the Pharaoh, and the *ḥazannu* (mayor) and *šarru* (king), ‘Abdi-Ḥeba of Jerusalem, wrote to Pharaoh: “I am very humbly your servant” (*a-na ka-tam IR₃-ka a-na-ku*).¹¹² Rib-Hadda of Byblos wrote in the same period and same context to request a *dīnu* (judgment) from Pharaoh, and Abi-Milki of Tyre also wrote the Pharaoh about the situation in and the hostilities breaking out in *mât Ki-na-aḥ-na ... mât Da-nu-na ... and al’U-ga-ri-it^{ki}*.¹¹³ In political terms, the Egyptian influence did not extend into the kingdom of Ugarit because at that time the Hittite empire dominated northern Syria.¹¹⁴ In local cultural and business terms, however, the system of Canaanite kingdoms in Canaan in the Late Bronze Age included Ashkelon, Lachish, Gath, Gezer, and Jerusalem.¹¹⁵ A group of similar Syro-Palestinian temples called “fortress temples” appeared at Ebla, Megiddo, Shechem, Hazor, and as far away as Ugarit and Zinjirli.¹¹⁶ This evidence from scholarship suggests that Ugarit and Jerusalem functioned within the same network of Levantine, indeed Canaanite and Phoenician, cities engaged in trade between the Hittite, Egyptian, and Assyrian empires.

Various scholars support the hypothesis that although Jerusalem and Ugarit lived under the political domination of separate empires during the second millennium B.C.E., they maintained similar local religious, social, and political systems typical of the Levant. The important Phoenician ports, cities, and lands of the Levantine coast included Ugarit with Beirut, Sidon, Tyre, and Byblos where the kings referred to each other as brothers and fellow citizens.¹¹⁷ The clay tablets from Ugarit reveal the trade, politics, and religion that Ugarit shared with its partners in the Levant.¹¹⁸ The Ugaritic texts contain clear indications of the Canaanite cultural matrix from which Judahite society emerged.¹¹⁹ Thus Mount *Ṣapunū* near Ugarit lies at the center of the Levantine cosmos.¹²⁰ Biblical Israel emerged from the southern branch of this Levantine culture.¹²¹ By the tenth century B.C.E., these same Canaanite cities played a central role in the trade and production network of the Levant.¹²² This study will proceed to take a closer look at this Levantine matrix

¹¹¹ Kuhrt, “Levant c. 1200–720,” 385.

¹¹² Na’aman, *Canaan*, 31–36, 50, 103; *EA* 285, 286, 287, 289; *EA* 147.

¹¹³ Na’aman, *Canaan*, 121.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 135; Rainey, “Amarna and Later,” 169–71.

¹¹⁵ Na’aman, *Canaan*, 147–54.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 290;

¹¹⁷ Arnaud, “Les ports de la ‘Phénicie,’” 181.

¹¹⁸ Kuhrt, “Syria and the Levant,” 304.

¹¹⁹ Wyatt, *Myths of Power*, 1–21.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ Finkelstein, “City-States to States,” 75.

¹²² Kuhrt, “Levant c. 1200–720,” 407.

of cities through the literature and trade treaties of Ugarit. The study will proceed with the hypothesis that Ugarit and Jerusalem shared some of the basic features of a common Levantine culture.

3.2. *Myths and Legends of Ugarit*

The myths and legends of Ugarit deal with the relationships among the gods and the royal family and provide a window into the religious, social, and political concerns of the city. Myths about gods and legends about royal families, of course, do not reflect actual social and political conditions in a society. As this chapter will argue, however, the myths reflect the values, possibilities, and ideal images of the gods and their relationships with human beings that a particular society conceived and accepted. Words express thoughts, and thoughts come from the persons, who write them down. The scribes live in a society that would influence them to write stories about gods and kings that fit into the normal state of affairs and reflect that society's values. The scribes of Ugarit did not write about Zeus and Athena, but about 'Ilu and 'Anatu because those gods represented their common understanding of their world that all Ugaritians would have understood.

3.2.1. Kirta

The legend of king Kirta (*krt*) appears at first glance to reveal a society in which ultimate authority rests with the god 'Ilu and with the human king Kirta.¹²³ King Kirta had no family (*'ummatu*) and cried about it until instructed in his dream by 'Ilu to set out and to find a mother (*'ummu*). He finds Huraya, who gives birth to a large family of fifteen children, restores the household, takes care of the state business, and appoints Yašib to rule when Kirta takes sick. Kirta took sick because of his unfulfilled vow to the female god 'Athirat Tyre (*šrm*), goddess of Sidon (*Sdynm*), who, like a god, would not suffer disrespect from a human being. Kirta remained sick without the mourning rituals until his daughter Thitmanit offered prayers for his recovery. In answer to Thitmanit's prayer, 'Ilu created a divine, female healer, who healed Kirta. On the other hand, Kirta's sons, Ilḥa'u (*ilḥu*) and Yašib (*yšb*), either just cry, as Kirta did, or rebuke him for falling sick.

The legend emphasizes the importance of family (*'ummatu*) and kinship (*šaphu*) relationships, which involve both human beings and gods in action with and against each other. The lack of a son in the household involves more than just a succession issue for a patriarchal household. It involves the creation of a family with active members young and old, male and female, and human and divine. The epic-myth teaches not that the patriarchs rule but

¹²³ Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 9–48.

that their rule and their significance depend on the active parts of those concerned—left to himself Kirta cried. With the help of ʾIlu, the army of three million, the kidnapped wife Huraya, and his daughter Thitmanit, Kirta survived. As the story depicts, the family members and their gods work in tandem and in tension to maintain the family and the kinship as a whole.

The Canaanite goddess ʾAthirat Tyre (*Ṣrm*), also goddess of Sidon (*Sdynm*), does not play the role of consort of ʾIlu or of Baʿlu, but had an independent and authoritative status in the myth and in the divine family. The negative role played by the independent ʾAthirat Tyre in the epic-myth suggests that the gods, at least ʾIlu, and the family of Kirta had an antagonistic attitude to the independent female god ʾAthirat Tyre. The loyal daughter Thitmanit reversed the curse of ʾAthirat Tyre by appealing to the authority of ʾIlu. The overall authority of ʾIlu remained static and ineffective without the actions of the members of the family.

The story of Kirta reveals other important characteristics of the multivalent, direct, and natural relationship between the gods, king Kirta, his family, and the legendary city of Ḫubur. ʾIlu appears to Kirta in a dream, and Kirta does not need an intermediate character to interpret his dream. ʾIlu wants Kirta to offer sacrifices before undertaking his mission to find a wife. ʾIlu orders Kirta to take Hulaya by force from her home. ʾAthirat Tyre accepts the unsolicited vow (*ydr*, *√ndr*) from Kirta and then punishes him with an illness for not fulfilling it. ʾIlu and Baʿlu accept Kirta's invitation to a banquet at which Baʿlu requests a blessing for Kirta, and ʾIlu obliges. Kirta's family calls Kirta a son (*bnm*) and a descendant (*šph*) of ʾIlu. Kirta's illness causes a drought as well, which in cosmic terms indicates some divine antagonism between ʾAthirat Tyre, who caused the illness, and Baʿlu, who brings the rain. ʾIlu alone can resolve the problem of ʾAthirat Tyre's curse by creating a new character, Šaʿtaqat (*šʿtqt*), out of dirt and blood.

A more complicated and convoluted set of relationships thus develops between the gods and the human characters in the legend of Kirta than in the imperial subjugation relationship of the deuteronomistic covenant. In Kirta the gods interact with each other as family members, and their relationships with each other influence their actions with the human beings. No one god controls the universe. King Kirta requests help from the god ʾIlu and has the option to obey the god or not. Kirta has no need of a *nābîʾ* spokesperson to interpret instructions from the gods. No written code of instruction imposes a command for conquest on the characters. Kirta receives punishment from the goddess ʾAthirat Tyre after breaking his voluntary vow but receives atonement for his offence to the god by means of the intercession of his daughter and the god ʾIlu. This myth-legend may reflect Levantine culture and religion and indicates at least that its author or its tradition conveyed Levantine human-divine relationships that differed in many significant ways from those of the Deuteronomist.

The legend of Kirta portrays a revered but not deified royal ancestor, whose destiny lies in the patronage of ʾIlu and the anger of ʾAṭiratu.¹²⁴ In this description of the proper relationships between gods and human beings, Olmo Lete points out that the hero had to fulfill the oracles granted and the vows made to the gods or suffer the consequences. The king hero takes on his status as a divine son by virtue of his service (*ʿābdu*) and faithfulness to the gods although the gods do not impose this faithfulness or service except as the payment for a salutary oracle. The Ugaritic myth/legend of Kirta thus presents a Canaanite world with no significant correspondences to that represented in the imperial DH except that one of the great heroes of the DH, David, attains his power and fame by virtue of his faithfulness and obedience to a god.

3.2.2. Aqhat

A second Ugaritic epic-myth-story, Aqhat, like that of Kirta, concerns the problems of a royal family and its relationships with each other and with the gods.¹²⁵ It presumes a static patriarchal structure, but the story itself does not concern that structure. The aging father, Danʾilu, has a holy status, *ʾilʾib* (godfather), and longs for a son. The god ʾIlu grants Danʾilu a son and sends him home to his wife Danatiya. When his son Aqhat grows up, Danʾilu gives him a valuable bow and arrows, but the “wine-sodden god, ʿAnatu,” desires them for herself. Aqhat denies her request and disdains her as a woman. Both of these actions reveal hubris on Aqhat’s part and stir up the divine anger of the goddess, who will not tolerate hubris and insult in a human being. This seals Aqhat’s fate as he himself foretold, and ʿAnat proceeds to have him killed. After seven years of drought, Aqhat’s mourning sister, Paghit, plans revenge. The legend of Aqhat teaches the proper way for human beings to relate to the gods, who play important roles in human lives. Danʾilu maintained the proper relationship of humility and gratitude to his benefactor ʾIlu and got what he wanted, whereas Aqhat refused the demand of the goddess ʿAnatu and insulted her. Regardless of ʿAnatu’s usual disposition, she had a divine right to punish the mortal for his insolence.

Like the legend of Kirta, the legend of Aqhat bears little resemblance to the deuteronomistic covenant. No one god controls the universe. Danʾilu requests help from ʾIlu and has the option to obey the god or not. Danʾilu has no need of a *nābîʾ* to interpret instructions from the gods. No written code of instruction imposes conquest on the characters. Aqhat receives punishment from ʿAnatu after treating the goddess with disrespect. Aqhat, however, does not receive atonement, as Kirta did, for his offence to the goddess. In this

¹²⁴ Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion*, 326–27.

¹²⁵ Parker and Smith, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 49–80.

legend, however, Aqhat does receive the final divine punishment of death without atonement, which does resemble the fate of the people of the god in the DH for their disobedience.

Wyatt sees this legend of Aqhat as a promotion of patriarchal social structure that portrays 'Anat's behavior as deviant,¹²⁶ but the story functions as a lesson about the danger of god-human relationships. 'Anatu desired Aqhat's weapons and punished him for his arrogant refusal; the human being that does not submit to a god suffers death.

The murder of Aqhat for his hubris may resemble the threat of death for those who disobey the command of the god of the DH. The epic of Aqhat and the DH, thus teach at least one similar lesson that lack of respect for a god will bring disaster. A great difference lies, however, in the motivation for the resistance. In Aqhat's case the god 'Anatu made a reasonable demand for a fair price, and he disdained her for no reason. In the case of the DH, the god made an impossible military demand (extermination of the resident population) with an unrealistic compensation (enjoyment of their land) and punished them for their passive resistance to an impossible bind.

3.2.3. Ba'lu and 'Anatu

A third Ugaritic myth, Ba'lu and 'Anatu, revolves around the issues of households and authority among the gods.¹²⁷ Contrary to what one might expect in a static patriarchal world, the goddesses have households (*bêtu*), and those households remain independent throughout. The myth begins with the generous and benevolent god 'Ilu, who lives in a tent at the source of springs and rivers on his own mountain *ġūri 'ili* (the mountain of 'Ilu; not Mount Šapān where Ba'lu lives).¹²⁸ He does not have a house/temple/palace (*bêtu*) for himself. When 'Ilu orders a *bêtu* for his favored prince, Yammu the prince of the sea, Ba'lu curses Yammu. So Yammu commands 'Ilu to give up Ba'lu, and 'Ilu submits to his demand. By means of borrowed weaponry, however, Ba'lu defeats Yammu and takes his kingship not by grant, covenant, or patriarchal authority but by eliminating his rival. If anything, he rules against the will of 'Ilu. The patriarch of the story, 'Ilu, appears to have no real authority or even a *bêtu* of his own.

The warrior goddess 'Anatu lives in her own *bêtu*, and this focus on a goddess household suggests that the author of the narrative recognized more than just a patriarchal household model. Furthermore, 'Anatu defends her *bêtu* on her own terms with her own arms. This military capability may represent nothing more than a fictional aberration from the "norm" or a sign of "ado-

¹²⁶ Wyatt, "Story of Aqhat," 251.

¹²⁷ Parker and Smith, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 81–180.

¹²⁸ Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 37.

lescent dysfunction,” as Walls proposed.¹²⁹ This primary source, however, indicates that the author had in mind at least a mythological conception, and perhaps even a model, of an independent female household. Evidence from other Ugaritic and Canaanite sources indicates that those societies recognized independent female royal households and businesses.¹³⁰

When Baʿlu complains that he has no *bētu*, ʿAnatu takes up his case. A ruling male god with no *bētu* begs the more powerful female god to advocate for him with ʾIlu. ʿAnatu and Baʿlu go to enlist the help of the senior goddess ʾAṭiratu, who also lives in her own *bētu* by the sea. Athiratu plays a decisive part in the outcome of the myth, and her importance may suggest a literary connection between Ugaritic *aṭryt*, ʾaṭriyatu (fate) and her name Athiratu (ʾaṭiratu). The senior divine couple, ʾAṭiratu and ʾIlu, do not live in the same household or even the same place. The translation of Smith at this point portrays ʾAṭiratu as “servile and deferential” to ʾIlu, but a different translation could indicate instead that she “cares for him” and “sends him generous gifts”: *tuʿāpip* (L-stem, √pp) “umsorgte; cared for,” and *tuḡazziyu* (D-stem, √gzy) “bediente; gave, gave gifts, lavished; served.”¹³¹ The younger male god, Baʿlu, had to enlist the assistance of both house-owning female gods, ʿAnatu and ʾAṭiratu, in order to get permission to build his own *bētu*.¹³² ʾIlu, the patriarch god, appears to have the respect of his family members but also no *bētu* of his own.

ʿAnatu, the warrior goddess, raised Baʿlu to the throne and provided him with a *bētu*. Ensnared in his new *bētu*, however, Baʿlu begins to boast about his wealth and power, and his hubris offends the more powerful god Môtū, who takes him to his death. ʿAnatu, however, does not accept fate, and demands: “You, Môtū, give up my brother!” Thus ʿAnatu comes across in this myth as the effectual warrior and character that alone has the power to establish divine households and to change the fate of gods. The roles of the gods in this story appear reversed from what one might expect in a static patriarchal society. This myth does not mean that Ugaritic had an army of women warriors, just as the myth of Athena did not predicate women warriors in Athens. It indicates nothing more than an existing, recorded concept of independent, strong female gods.

The myth of Baʿlu and ʿAnatu has little in common with the DH covenant. No imperial one god or patriarch controls the universe. No human beings play a significant part in the lives of the gods. The gods have close but tense and violent familial relationships with each other. No written code of instruction imposes on the characters the need for the conquest of land. This

¹²⁹ Walls, *Goddess Anat*, 75.

¹³⁰ Meyers, “Material Remains,” 426; Vita, “Society of Ugarit,” 481.

¹³¹ Smith, “Baal Cycle,” 122; Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik*, 579, 669.

¹³² Binger, “Asherah in Ugarit,” 81.

myth depicts the early gods of one city within the Levant, who differed in many significant ways from the god of the DH.

3.3. *Role of Myth in Ugaritic Society*

The Ugaritic myths and legends depict a triadic family paradigm of gods and royals. Olmo Lete includes Ugaritic myth in his analysis of Canaanite religion, which begins with the regal parental couple ʾIlu and ʾAṭiratu where the divine world has the structure of a family and a twofold pattern of god as father and king. This analysis acknowledges a model family and social structure in which the lesser gods Baʿalu and ʿAnatu work together against their competitors. The ritual texts of Ugarit portray the gods according to their hierarchal function in the cult where no standard, static, or rigid sequence emerges from these categorizations. The ritual texts, like the mythical texts, portray Canaanite and Ugaritic religion as characterized by “expansion, diversification, fluidity, syncretism, and exchange.”¹³³ No one god commands the destruction of the ʾēlōhīm ʾāhērīm.

What relevance does Ugaritic myth have to the actual religion and culture of Ugarit? The ritual of the feast in Ugarit—recall that ʾIlu and Baʿlu shared a feast with human Kirta—according to Mark S. Smith, symbolizes agricultural success and confirms that divine characters correspond to human beings and in particular to the royal elite.¹³⁴ He proposes a self-identification of divine and human roles in the feast ceremony as the center of a royal scheme of reality. The royal family of Ugarit identified with the divine family of myth and projected its own values into that sacred world of myth and legend. Smith’s study confirms the family orientation of Ugaritic religion and social structure.

In Ugaritic myth and legend, the royal family had a close relationship to the gods as Karel van der Toorn notes. In the legend of Kirta, the titles *bin ʾili* and *šapah ʾili* (son of ʾIlu; descendant of ʾIlu) illustrate an ideology of the royal family in which kings have personal, familial relationships with the god.¹³⁵ In the legend of Aqhatu, ʾIlu plays the role of family god or *ʾil bēti* (god of the house or dynasty), and Danʾilu serves as *ʿabd ʾIli* (servant of ʾIlu).¹³⁶ The ritual texts of Ugarit attest to the storm-god Baal Haddu as the patron god, *ʾil bēti*, of Ugaritian kings. Baal Haddu joined the goddess *Ušhara* (*ʾušhry*) as patron goddess of the city-kingdom of Ugarit. Toorn’s study thus attests to the close link of god ʾIlu to royalty, to the dual role of king as son and servant of the god, and to a heterarchal sharing of authority

¹³³ Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion*, 48.

¹³⁴ Smith, *Rituals and Myths*, 139–43.

¹³⁵ Toorn, *Family Religion*, 170; Parker and Smith, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 31: lines 20–22.

¹³⁶ Toorn, *Family Religion*, 170.

between the divine and royal couples. None of these paradigms conforms to the imperial model of the DH. We see instead a model for the *ʾil bēti* (god of the house) and the *ʿabd ʾili* (servant of the god).

Canaanite-Phoenician religion associates divinity with royal families as Philip C. Schmitz notes, and has much in common with the well-documented Ugaritic religion.¹³⁷ Sacrifice, vows, prayer, natural cult sites, and divinity associated with family structure take a prominent place in Levantine religion. In particular, Phoenician pantheons reflect human analogies of nuclear families and kin relationships and thus form a triadic family structure. The complex Ugaritic myths depict discreet households of gods that mirror the structure of human society. Thus Schmitz links Ugarit with Phoenicia and Canaan in their common Levantine matrix and suggests that the triadic family structure of the divine families extends beyond city boundaries and beyond the royal families into common human families.

Kinship-based structures in peasant agriculture of the Iron II Age settlements of Judah and Israel, which Carol Meyers has studied, share this triadic family structure.¹³⁸ She investigates the “built environment” of the household, the persons, the activities, and the strategy of production.¹³⁹ She finds in the household (*bayit*) a division of labor by gender within a common social space. Beyond the *bayit*, women formed craft-oriented neighborhood organizations called *šakēnôt* and kin groups called *mišpāḥôt* for the mutual aid and protection of their families. The women’s households, neighborhoods, and kin groups had their own structures and hierarchies that functioned in a complementary role to the male hierarchies. Meyers calls this arrangement a heterarchy, and her study supports the idea of a common Levantine triadic social and religious structure extending up and down the social scale from the gods of the cities of Ugarit and Phoenicia to the agricultural settlements of Judah.

A triadic family social matrix thus may provide a more accurate picture of the common Levantine relationships among the gods, the kings, their families, and their citizens. Two synonymous Ugaritic terms characterize this relationship: *ʾummatu* (family), derived from *ʾummu* (mother), and *šapḥu* (family; descendant; kinship) (related to Hebrew *ʾēm* and *mišpāḥā*). In this family matrix, gods, goddesses, and their children struggle together in tandem and in tension with each other and with the royal family to survive and to hold on to their integrity and power. This triadic and heterarchal family structure reflects the levels of the society from the god’s *bētu* into the common agricultural *bētu*. This Canaanite matrix so far bears little resemblance to the imperial universe of the DH.

¹³⁷ Schmitz, “Phoenician Religion,” 5:358–59.

¹³⁸ Meyers, “Material Remains,” 426.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 427.

3.4. *Triadic Family Matrix*

How does the matrix of household and family fit into social and political analyses of Ugarit, such as that of Vita, which reveals a complex society with three main classes: royalty, administrative personnel, and citizens.¹⁴⁰ The class of slaves and fugitives at the bottom served as chattel and had no rights. At the top of the society stood the royal family, the military, and the scribes, whose lives revolved around ownership of land. The king ruled and functioned as the intermediary between the kingdom and the god; sacred ritual focused on the king. In hierarchical order, the king, the *šakīnu* (administrator), the queen, the royal family, and the noble houses of the palace administered the economy. The queen, often of foreign descent, had a separate position from the king, owned her own patrimony (ancestral inheritance), and controlled her own *bīt šarrati* (House of the Queen). Officials in the administrative class included the *rabû* (chief) of many administrative sections and the *dayyānû* (judges), who functioned in the Ugaritic legal administration. Priests (*khnm*, *qdšm*) also belonged to the administrative structure of the palace. Ugaritian citizens owned private property and could dispose of it as they wished so that a patrimony could go to a wife as well as to an elder son. The legend of Aqhat describes the traditional duties of a son with regard to the ancestral inheritance. Under the guardianship of a father or a husband, women owned their own property and businesses and had full patrimonial rights over their property. The myth of Baʿalu and ʿAnatu describes the independent households of the goddesses ʿAnatu and ʿAṭiratu. Vita's study thus reveals an extended kinship-based society with complex and triadic sociopolitical organization around land, business, and property ownership. He does not reduce a complex society to a single overarching concept of imperial rule of one god, static patriarchy, or a patrimonial household model. The preoccupation with ownership of land, however, does sound a familiar theme with the DH although Ugaritic gods do not propose ownership by imperial legal conquest.

Other studies confirm the picture of a triadic and dynamic family and social structure of other cities within the sphere of the Levant. Stern's analysis of Sarepta suggests that the city held the royal family—king, the queen, and the child god—as the objects of worship.¹⁴¹ The Baʿalatu temple in Hamath and the Ištar temple in Alalakh provided examples both of the common Syro-Palestinian gods and architecture and also of the expansive and inclusive business economies of the Levant.¹⁴² Ackerman's argument for the ubiqui-

¹⁴⁰ Vita, "Society of Ugarit," 455–98.

¹⁴¹ Stern, "Phoenician Source," 301.

¹⁴² Buhl, "Hamath," 3.33–36.

tous presence of a female goddess Asherah in ordinary households and in the temple fits into this same model of a triadic and inclusive society.¹⁴³

Other studies, however, present another view of the Levant. Buccellati mixes the terms of covenant with the terms tribal kinship and national society to propose a sociopolitical theory.¹⁴⁴ Buccellati's concept of a "kinship covenant," however, does not take into account the common sense argument that kinship relationships do not require oaths of loyalty but exist of themselves as a natural part of the culture. His concept of a national state with a kinship covenant comes from reports of nomadic tribes from ancient and modern Mari. Buccellati proposes an evolutionary development of a central government out of tribal nomadic institutions through progressive differentiation of social classes into a bureaucracy and a fusing of charismatic leaders with the dynastic families. This paradigm superimposes the structures of the DH and a modern Weberian typology on the evidence. It does not recognize that such social evolution occurs over long periods of time, since modern nomadic tribes did not evolve into imperial monarchies. The present study differentiates the concept of covenant from that of kinship.

A totemic image of Levantine society and a triadic family and kinship structure, however, would oversimplify the society. The triadic social and religious matrix did not constitute an embedded hierarchy or a political paradigm because each family remained discreet within their own classes. Levantine societies had a political and economic structure independent of the kinship structure although the two structures overlapped.

3.5. *Dyadic Master-Servant Political Hierarchy*

Ugaritian society held together not by kinship or triadic family identification with the royal family but by a network or a matrix of master-servant relationships related to service and employment. By means of his study of the cult of Ugarit, Olmo Lete introduces the political aspect of Ugaritian religion and society. He notes a twofold pattern in the cult in which 'Ilu plays the dual role of father and king.¹⁴⁵ The human king takes on his title *bin 'Ili* (son of 'Ilu) not by right of blood, however, but by virtue of his service, *'abdu or ardu*, to the gods. The cultic structure of service, *'abdu/ardu*, intertwines with the social structure of family, *'ummatu/šaphu*, but the foundation of each relationship remains distinct. A cult hierarchy of gods and functionaries serve the royal family and the gods of the dynasty according to their levels of service in the cult where no static or rigid patriarchal sequence

¹⁴³ Ackerman, "At Home with the Goddess," 458.

¹⁴⁴ Buccellati, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria*, 234.

¹⁴⁵ Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion*, 48.

emerges.¹⁴⁶ A fluid hierarchy of cultic servants gives the key to the political relationships between the discreet families and classes of Ugarit.

Vita's related political analysis of Ugarit reveals a similar complex and dynamic hierarchy of service.¹⁴⁷ Individuals and groups worked together in a service hierarchy but did not share in each other's family patrimony or ancestral inheritance. Patrimony as a family inheritance operated apart from an individual's political position and separate even from one's family relationships. Patrimony may refer to one's private property in the form of an inheritance of land, a business, or a position. Such inheritance did not leave the family, and each family owned its private property. Ugarit did not consist of one huge overarching patrimonial inherited estate in which everybody's property belonged to the king and the god. Even the queen had a separate position from the king and owned and controlled her own family property. The queen thus controlled her own *bît šarrati* (House of the Queen). Officials and administrators did not represent their families or a set of particular embedded households. Individuals held their offices by virtue of service (*ʿabdu, ardu*), ability, and loyalty down the political ladder following the sequence of *arad ardi* (servant of a servant). In this sense Ugarit's political structure resembled that of a small-scale bureaucracy. Vita's study has pointed out three important and distinguishing characteristics of Ugaritian society. He confirms the dyadic civil servant hierarchy among free male and female citizens. He confirms patrimony as a discreet component of family structure rather than as an overarching political principle. He confirms the existence of private property among nonpatriarchal women's households.

This dyadic servant political matrix intertwined with the triadic family social matrix in the sense that each household down to the level of farm settlement had the form of a *bêt ʾummati* or *bêt mišpāḥâ*, which resembled that of the royal family and the gods. At the same time, each family had a distinct hierarchal political relationship, *arad ardi*, with individuals, not households, above and below. In order to understand this view of the administrative structure of the Levantine city-kingdom, however, this study will back up and distinguish it from three important theories concerning Ugarit: Cross's patriarchal model, Schloen's theory of the patrimonial household model, and Weber's ideal types of patriarchy and patrimonialism.

3.6. *Patriarchy and the Patrimonial Household Model*

The concern for a *bētu* in the myth of Baʿlu and ʿAnatu brings up the problem of the presupposition of the *bêt ʾāb* (house of the father) model and the ideal type of the patrimonial household model in Ugaritic studies. The concept of

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 58.

¹⁴⁷ Vita, "Society of Ugarit," 455–98.

the static patriarchal social structure finds full expression in Frank M. Cross's analysis of the Ugaritic deity 'El. "The myths of 'El," writes Cross, "present static or eternal structures which constitute nature and the uneasy order of a patriarchal society."¹⁴⁸ Cross borrows this typology, however, from Albrecht Alt's analysis of patriarchal texts. Alt identified a group of epithets, which identify a god by the name of a patriarch, and created a typology called "the gods of the Fathers." Alt distinguished and set up a binary opposition between the biblical patriarchal god of the fathers and the Canaanite 'ēlim as the gods of holy places. At the same time, however, Alt equated kinship and covenantal relationships so that the patriarchal god 'El led the way for the covenantal god Yahweh. Cross uses this typology and the evidence of the Aramaic inscription at Zinjirli, that refers to "the gods of my father's house," to construct a theory about a static patriarchal religion in Ugarit. This ideal type of static patriarchalism then governs Cross's interpretation of the myths and legends of Ugarit. 'El ('Ilu) acts as divine patriarch in the Canaanite mythology. In this role he rules over, arbitrates, and judges among the various lesser and competing deities Ba'lu, Yammu, Môt, his daughter 'Anat, and wife 'Ašerah-'elat. Cross's 'El exemplifies the patriarchal deity.

This ideal type of patriarchal sociopolitical paradigm of the house of the father (*bêt 'āb*) governs the analysis of Ugarit by other leading scholars. The study of Levantine culture by David Schloen discusses premonarchic Israel's common patriarchal identity and its place within the *bêt 'āb* paradigm.¹⁴⁹ Schloen also employs Weber's ideal type of patrimonialism and an analogy with modern Islamic society to create a model that he calls the patrimonial household model (PHM). He argues that this universal paradigm explains the sociopolitical structures of Ugarit, Judah, and the ancient Near East.

Applying the PHM paradigm to Ugarit, Schloen sees the state as an embedded extension of the king's household. Ugarit belonged to the cultural world of the Canaanites, and the Canaanite cities maintained their own social and economic structures within the ideal of the mythical house of 'Ilu (*bêt 'ili*). This PHM defines the connection between royal service, a land-grant system, and nested households. In this scheme, the king at the center of the city grants land to favored subjects, who become landlords, and landless others become dependent slaves and chattel within their households. This hierarchical set of households in a system of personal dyadic relationships then forms the series of nested households that make up the political structure of the PHM kingdom. The difficulty in Schloen's patrimonial household model lies in his concept of the nested households, which assumes that households in the kingdom formed part of one big royal household. Schloen misses the

¹⁴⁸ Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 37, 42.

¹⁴⁹ Schloen, *House of the Father*, 6.

matrix of service and employment that links unrelated households together. A social political system with personal dyadic relationships of service differs from one with patrimonial kinship and consanguinous households.

The primary source that Schloen introduces to illustrate this PHM instead reveals the inherent weakness of the model: the edict of Ḫattušili III refers to “any servant of a servant of the king of Ugarit” (*arad ardi šār māṭ ú-ga-ri-it ma-am-ma*).¹⁵⁰ A Hittite imperial system of dyadic servant relationships, *arad ardi*, however, does not support an argument for a *bêt ʿāb* patriarchal system. The master-servant network instead supports an argument for a society with dyadic service relationships as in a *bīt ardi* or *bêt ʿabdi* (house of a servant) matrix. Schloen acknowledges this service hierarchy but fits it into the model of a strict patrimonial and patriarchal *bêt ʿāb* social system. Yet favored individuals attain their land by service (*ardu*) to the king rather than by kin relation. Service relationships differ in their purpose and function from kin relationships. In addition Schloen does not recognize the existence of other household models. The myth of Baʿalu and ʿAnatu depicts both ʿAnatu and ʿAṭiratu living in separate and independent goddess households.

By including the master-servant personal dyadic relationship under the rubric of the PHM, Schloen then attempts to include the imperial Assyrian culture under the same rubric.¹⁵¹ This argument again does not distinguish between the oath-based covenantal dyadic nature of the imperial social structure and that of a kinship-based, tribal social structure. The basic difference lies between actual local kinship ties and ties of service. Under the latter, strangers or former enemies become tied to each other through service, employment, or oath. Even though the imperial covenant (*bīt ardi*) may aspire to the rhetoric of a family relationship (*bêt mišpāḥā*), under the rubric of fictive kinship, its basic structure and function remain distinct.

Other prominent scholars have not separated the concept of a patrimonial society (*bêt ʿāb*) from that of a service-oriented political society (*arad ardi*). Lawrence E. Stager describes the *bêt ʿāb* culture of Israel as a series of nested households from the farmsteads to the royal *bytdwd* (house of David; Judah) and the *bīt Ḫumri* (house of Ḫumri; Israel).¹⁵² Stager’s analysis of the *bêt ʿāb* patrimonial society, however, follows two sources: patrimonialism and the DH. First, he follows Weber’s concept of patrimonialism, which Weber thought derived from blood-kinship, inheritance, and the household of a father. Closer analysis of Weber’s theory, however, has suggested that his ideal type of a patrimonial state depended instead on a “personal domain

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 252.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 64.

¹⁵² Stager, “Forging an Identity,” 113. Keel accepts this view: “David had a patrimonial kingdom with a large area under his personal control” (my translation) (Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems*, 157).

built on personal loyalties.”¹⁵³ Thus, contrary to both Stager and Weber, what they call the patrimonial household describes instead a *bīt ardi* social and political arrangement of loyalty and service rather than family patrimony.

Stager also follows Dtr, who wrote that Solomon’s (Neo-Assyrian) imperial districts of the seventh century B.C.E. represented the tribal areas of the tenth century B.C.E. This depiction results in an analysis of a patrimonial order of the tribal-royal organization along a ladder of vertical, dyadic relationships from *‘ebed* the slave to *‘ebed hammelek*. This fluid social order of the master-servant relationship of loyalty and service would provide a better explanation for the rise of Saul and David from humble beginnings to rulers of the state. It also suggests the difference between the local kinship state and the imperial covenant state. In a kinship state of *bêt ‘āb* households, such a rise to power could not take place because one’s social place and connections would stay embedded in one’s kinship ties, inheritance, and patrimony. In a society of service, the servant (*‘ebed, arad ardi*) could rise through the ranks by service, ability, and loyalty to one’s master as David did. Stager’s observation suggests, contrary to his own assertion, that the society as depicted in DH had a *bêt ‘ebed* imperial structure rather than a *bêt ‘āb* patriarchal, patrimonial structure.

3.7. Weber

This conceptual problem of the ambiguity between the *bīt ardi* / *bêt ‘ebed* imperial structure and the *bêt ‘āb* patriarchal structure began with Weber, who conceived of a patrimonial state as an extension of a traditional patriarchal household. As Weber writes:

Patriarchal domination is based on ... a strictly personal loyalty. The roots of patriarchal domination grow out of the master’s authority over his household. ... Such personal authority has ... an everyday character ... and finds inner support in the subjects’ compliance with norms. ... Under patriarchal domination the norms derive from tradition. ... The two basic elements of patriarchal authority then are piety toward tradition and toward the master.¹⁵⁴

Weber’s ambiguity began with his conceiving of patriarchalism as personal loyalty and tradition. In the context of patriarchalism, such loyalty and tradition stem from blood, kinship, and family relationships, which ruling families can extend by means of marriage. Weber looks at a single abstracted aspect of the power structure without looking at the underlying sociopolitical structure.

¹⁵³ Idem, “Patrimonial Kingdom of Solomon,” 67.

¹⁵⁴ Weber, *Economy and Society*, 1006–13.

This abstract methodology leads Weber to make a similar ambiguous claim about patrimonialism as an extension of patriarchalism. As he writes:

At first it [patrimonial domination] is only a decentralization of the household when the lord settles dependents (including young men regarded as family members) on plots within his extended land-holdings, with a house and a family of their own. ... The dependency relationship itself continues to be based on loyalty and fidelity. However, such a relationship, even if it constitutes at first a purely one-sided domination, always evolves the subjects' claim to reciprocity, and this claim 'naturally' acquires social recognition as custom.¹⁵⁵

Weber conceives of a patrimonial state evolving out of a patriarchal state. The extended family grows large enough to become subjects, who want reciprocity from the master. Reciprocity, however, does not mean patri-mony. When Weber talks about a patrimonial society, however, he thinks of an extended patriarchal society but in fact refers to a master-servant state society of reciprocal economic relationships founded on non-blood-related service. The family fidelity at the base of a limited patriarchal society does not rest on the same foundation as the fidelity of an unlimited imperial state, which depends on the exchange of goods and services between masters and servants.

In his description of patrimonial domination, Weber adds, "custom prescribes that the subject support the master with all available means. ... Mere habituation is the first factor that stereotypes the patrimonial relationship."¹⁵⁶ This analysis does not provide an accurate picture of the relationship between master and servant in what Weber calls a patrimonial state. Patrimony means an "estate inherited from one's father," but Weber extends his definition of patrimonialism into the realm of master and subject. Weber has obfuscated the issue by turning a master and subject relationship into a patrimonial one, but the two concepts belong to separate categories.

After having extended patriarchalism into patrimonialism, Weber extends this paradigm even further into what he calls the patrimonial state in which "a prince organizes his political power over extrapatrimonial areas and political subjects ... just like the exercise of his patriarchal power." Weber extends this paradigm of patriarchal domination far beyond its applicability and continues, "The majority of great continental empires had a strong patrimonial character."¹⁵⁷ Weber instead refers here to the common concept of loyalty that runs through patriarchalism to imperialism but does not draw the necessary distinction between small scale, local kin relationships and rela-

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 1006–13.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

tionships spread across kin, city, and territorial boundaries. Such extended political loyalty may borrow the rhetoric of patriarchalism and the idea of fictive kinship but in fact rests on other grounds.

Following Weber's ambiguous analysis, the ideal type of the *bēt ʿāb* patriarchal sociopolitical paradigm and the patrimonial household model mix the dyadic personal master-servant relationships with the imagery of patrimonial relationships and thus view the state as an extension of the king's household. The *bēt ʿāb* patriarchal paradigm, Alt's typology of the god of the fathers, Cross's static patriarchalism, and Schloen's PHM rest on the foundation of Weber's ideal type of patriarchal patrimonialism. They do not reflect the actual conditions in the literature, the society, or the state of Ugarit and the Levant but instead represent an imposition of an ideal type on the evidence. In particular, the patriarchal, patrimonial household model does not account for the evidence of independent female households, myths of goddess warriors, a goddess of "fate" (ʿAthirātu), and the goddess temples in Ugarit and the Levant. It does not account for the ubiquitous presence of triadic family relationships among the gods and the citizens. Nor does it account for the local service hierarchies and the economic relationships among the small trading cities of the Levant.

3.8. *Paradigms: (1) ʿummatu, bēt šaphi and (2) bīt ardi / arad ardi*

This study thus proposes two new paradigms that intertwine and complement each other in Ugarit: (1) A triadic family set of kinship relationships fashioned after the model of *ʿummatu* (family) and *bēt šaphi / bēt mišpāhā* (house of kinship), which forms the basic social structure of the Levant. (2) A dyadic, master-servant hierarchy of political relationships envisioned in the model of the *bēt ʿēbēd* or *bīt ardi / arad ardi* (house of servant / servant of servant) structure. This study hypothesizes that these social and political paradigms may apply to other Canaanite, Phoenician, and Levantine cities.

3.9. *Levantine Defensive and Cooperative Warfare*

The mythical world of Ugarit, and by extension the mythical world of the Levant, did not revolve around an imperial military covenantal law of obedience, annihilation, and punishment.¹⁵⁸ The generous and benevolent ʾIlū lives in a tent at the source of springs and rivers on a mountain and does not even own a *bētu* (temple, palace). He prepares feasts and reveals words of heaven from his mountain tent. When he orders a *bētu* (palace) for Yamm, Baal curses the prince of the sea out of envy. When the imperious Yammu

¹⁵⁸ Parker and Smith, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, passim.

demands that 'Ilu give up Ba'lu, he gives up Ba'lu without an argument. With the help of Kothar's weaponry, however, Ba'lu smashes his enemy and takes his eternal kingship. This myth presents the closest hint of violence in the Canaanite myth of warfare, yet in its small and personal scale, it does not compare with DH god's command for the annihilation of whole populations. Ba'lu attains kingship by eliminating his rival rather than by grant or by covenant. If anything, he rules against the will of the principal god 'Ilu. This action does not presume a stable and obedient patriarchal system nor a policy of military extermination, but a complicated and cooperative nature of Ba'lu and Kothar stands out in response to Yammu's aggression. This paradigm of Canaanite defensive military action by alliance reappears in the defensive treaties and alliances of the Levantine kingdoms in response to the aggression of their neighboring empires.

The closest thing that Ugaritic myth offers to a conquest narrative appears in the introduction to the warrior maiden 'Anatu. She appears knee-deep in the blood, gore, and heads of mortals. The reader does not learn the reason or the motive for 'Anatu's battle, but she came out of it a successful warrior. After her successful battle, the young woman 'Anatu retires to her *bêtu* and sings of her passionate relationship with Ba'lu. 'Anatu defends her *bêtu* on her own terms with her own arms and does not even need the help of special weapons. She does not fight under command of an imperial god, and the story does not tell of 'Anatu's conquests at the head of a human army.

When Ba'lu cries that he has no *bêtu*, 'Anatu takes up his case. A ruling male god with no *bêtu* begs the more powerful female god to advocate for him with the head god. The head god also has no *bêtu* but lives as a bull that grazes among the springs and streams of his mountain. 'Anatu and Baal go to enlist the help of the goddess 'Athiratu, who also lives in her own *bêtu*. 'Athiratu and 'Ilu do not live in the same household or even the same place although they love each other. The narrative emphasizes the beautiful natural settings in which these two gods live in their own households rather than together in one household under strict patriarchal rule. Questions of domination, possessions, conquests, exterminations, and punishments do not fit into this world. From this dynamic but self-contained family of gods, one does not get a sense of aggressive imperial projection of power, demand for more land, and the elements that make up the deuteronomistic covenant.

Biblical scholars nevertheless draw a direct connection between 'Aṭiratu of Ugarit and the nondescript Asherah of the DH even though the two characters have almost nothing in common.¹⁵⁹ Day identifies 'Aṭiratu with Asherah and refers to her as the consort of 'El. This comparison misleads because 'Aṭiratu and 'Ilu live in separate households, and the text refers to 'Aṭiratu as a creator of gods (*qnyt ilm* "Schöpferin der Götter"), including 'Ilu, rather than as

¹⁵⁹ Day, "Asherah," 1:483–87.

their mother.¹⁶⁰ Binger brings out some of the hidden characteristics of ʾAṭīratu and her position in Ugaritian religion.¹⁶¹ ʾAṭīratu of Ugarit created gods under her own power and perhaps created ʾIlu as well. In the Baʿlu myth, she appears with a spindle that represents her textile industry. She honors ʿAnatu’s request for a household for the houseless Baʿlu. As the myth goes, ʾAṭīratu, *rabītu* (great lady) and creator, takes precedence in the actions of the so-called pantheon and constitutes the real power behind the façade authority of ʾIlu. Although the ancient traditions of Hebrew ʾEl and ʾAšerāh derive from the common Levantine culture of ʾIlu and ʾAthīratu, the character of ʾAthīratu has little in common with the shadowy Asherah, and the circumstances and context of ʾAthīratu of Ugarit and Tyre have little in common with the imperial world of the DH.

The story of Baʿlu’s hubris and death also reflects a structure lacking in imperial aggression. ʾIlu and Athīratu cannot find a suitable replacement for Baʿlu but place one of ʾAthīratu’s sons on the throne anyway. Baʿlu, the so-called mightiest ruler, has strength for wealth and lust. He submits to the threat of Mōtu and goes to his death without a fight. Such a god has little in common with the imperial god of the DH.

The final segment of the myth reveals the source of power in the Ugaritic myth. Ugaritic literature portrays ʿAnatu as a “fierce, invincible warrior, slaughtering people ... and reveling in fighting and destruction.”¹⁶² According to Maier, scholars tend to pair ʿAnatu with Baʿlu as his consort or partner, but this characterization gives the passive Baʿlu too much credit. The passion of ʿAnatu raises Baal to the throne, provides him with a *bētu*, and raises him from the dead. ʿAnatu does not accept fate: “You, Mōtu, give up my brother!” Thus she comes across in this story as the real mightiest warrior, who takes action and succeeds in her endeavors, and even reverses fate.

Not one of the gods can resist ʿAnatu, however, not because of her feminine charms, but because she loves the taste of victory, wields the quickest sword, and loves with the strongest passion. This study accepts such a strong character on her own terms. Walls describes ʿAnatu as an independent and unrestrained female god, who hunts, makes war, and has violent temper.¹⁶³ As a fearsome and aggressive warrior, ʿAnatu disdains feminine social identity. ʿAnatu, on the other hand, provides the meaningful action in the narrative. The passion of ʿAnatu drives the narrative and creates the new world with Baʿlu on the throne but still reveals no imperial aggression.

Cross describes ʾIlu as the “divine warrior of the holy war ideology of the league,” but this description does not match that of the passive, ancient ʾIlu

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 1:483; Parker and Smith, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 127; Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik*, 666.

¹⁶¹ Binger, “Asherah in Ugarit,” 42.

¹⁶² Maier, “Anath,” 1:226.

¹⁶³ Walls, *Goddess Anat*, 1.

of *gūri ʾili* from Ugaritic myth.¹⁶⁴ No imperial conquest myth comes from Canaanite, Ugaritic, or Levantine sources. According to Cross, the “era of the league” represents the earliest biblical tradition, but even if ancient, its late imperial concepts of warrior king, conquest, and covenant appear more consistent with Dtr than with Levantine traditions. For instance, ʿAnatu represents the real warrior from Ugaritic myth, but Cross accepts the idea that the warrior image comes from Baʿlu because of his early storm theophany. A storm theophany that brings rain for the crops does not imply military power. In the book of Judges, which may describe conditions in the land of Canaan before the composition of the DH, the song of Deborah appears to compare YHWH to a storm-god, who, like Baʿlu, brings violent thunder and rain, as follows:

*yhwh ... bə-šaʿdākā miššādēh ʾēdôm ʾereš rāʿāšāh gam-šāmayim
nātpû gam-ʿābîm nātpû māyim*
YHWH ... when you marched from the region of Edom, the earth
trembled, and the heavens poured, the clouds indeed poured water
(Judg 5:4).

Indeed Baʿlu does have storm theophany, but, in the Ugaritic myth, neither Baʿlu nor ʾIlu has a reputation for fighting or aggression.

The real power and decisive authority within the Ugaritic myth come from the goddess ʿAnatu. The story does not indicate a matriarchy in Ugarit but does attest to the decentralized nodes of power in Ugaritian society and the paradigm of an extended egalitarian family that both supports and fights with each other. This in turn reflects the political and cultural situation among the various competitive city-kingdoms within the Levant.

Scholars, however, follow DH presuppositions in analyzing Canaanite myth. Gibson, for instance, interprets El as conniving and in control over the chaotic events and keeping a balance in the world.¹⁶⁵ He does not acknowledge the crucial role of ʿAnatu in the myth.¹⁶⁶ These efforts to interpret Ugaritic myth with the presuppositions of the later DH fail although the connection to ancient Canaanite myth still holds.

Despite the efforts of scholars to align Ugaritic myth and legend with the imperial world of the DH, the myths belie their efforts and leave no trace of imperial aggression, demands for obedience, conquest, extermination of populations, and punishments for disobedience. Levantine ideal types of gods and kings live in families that compete, help, and fight each other in tandem and in tension but draw together in defensive alliances and coalitions to take military action to defend each other against outside aggressors.

¹⁶⁴ Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 99.

¹⁶⁵ Gibson, “Mythological Texts,” 198.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 193.

3.10. *Treaties of Trade, Mutual Defense, and Return of Fugitives*

Although the mortal gods of Ugarit lived and died in their personal struggles, and Aqhatu the man died for his insult to the goddess 'Anatu, no concept of punishment by death or exile for disobedience to a command for extermination occurs in Ugaritic myth or political policy. The small states of the Levant, by contrast with the agenda of the DH, endeavored to protect their neighbor's property, persons, and trade. The Levantine treaties wrote of alliance, cooperation, mutual defense against aggression, and protection of property and trade from criminals and bandits.

Family, kinship, and personal relationships of service did not extend beyond the city and territorial limits, so the cities of the Levant devised other ways of contracting relationships with each other. These cities had a complex hybrid character of a kingdom, as Vita refers to them, which sat on a trade route and consisted of a central city with a surrounding agricultural area within a radius of about twenty kilometers.¹⁶⁷ The city-kingdom of Ugarit itself had a city population of about 6,000 and a surrounding population of up to 25,000. The people of the city came from various areas of the Levant and reflected its prosperous culture of trade and business. The population consisted of traders from Hattuša and Cyprus (*'altty*, *'Alēthiyya*), Hurrians, and Amorites. Ugarit shared a common trade network with the region of coastal Syria and South Canaan and maintained close political, commercial, and personal relationships with its neighbors. The cities of this common Levantine trader (*kāna'ānî*) culture conducted lucrative business enterprises with the empires and evinced a degree of integration into the Ugaritian administrative system.¹⁶⁸

The earliest Ugaritic document in Amarna consists of a letter to Akhenaton from friendly Ugarit (1350 B.C.E.) as follows: *a-nu-um-ma ardu a-na dŠamši^{si} bēli-ia a-na-ku ... a-na māt^{al} Ū-ga-ri-ti* (Indeed I am a servant to the Sun, my lord ... to [the district of] Ugarit).¹⁶⁹ Later on under the rule of Hattuša, the coast from Ugarit to Byblos allied with the Amurrites against Egypt (*EA* 98), as follows: *i-nu-ma na-ak-ra-at-mi gab-bi mātātī ... iš-tu^{alu} Gu-ub-liki a-di^{alu} Ū-ga-ri-ti* (now all the lands from Gubla to Ugarit have become estranged).¹⁷⁰

Ugarit's normal relationships, treaties, and agreements, even with Hattuša, reflect mutual interests in protecting international trade around the Mediterranean and Upper Mesopotamia. Their treaties deal with exchange of ambassadors and fugitives as well as the displaced class of *ḥabiru* (*'prm*), who often interfered with the transportation of trade goods. Royal women

¹⁶⁷ Vita, "Society of Ugarit," 467.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 459.

¹⁶⁹ Singer, "Political History of Ugarit," 622.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 627; *EA* 45.

played prominent roles in the trader culture of Ugarit. Queen Tharīllu (*tryl*) of Ugarit operated a large business enterprise between Ugarit, Emar, Egypt, and the Phoenician port towns.¹⁷¹ She enjoyed special prestige and outstanding political roles as attested by her international correspondence with Ḫattuša and Carchemish. Queen Aḫat-Milku of Ugarit played a similar dominant role as queen in the thirteenth century B.C.E. After the peace treaty of 1258 B.C.E. between Egypt and Ḫattuša, Ugarit played a pivotal role in grain shipment from Egypt to the faltering Hittite empire.

From the fourteenth to the twelfth century B.C.E., Ugarit functioned as the center of international trade between Mari and the Aegean.¹⁷² A class of international businessmen (including Queens Šarelli and Aḫat-Milku) called *tamkāru* (Akk.; Ug. *mkrm* or *makkāruma*) operated the royal monopolies by means of agreements and treaties with Ḫattuša, Carchemish, Emar, and Canaan. The reciprocal agreement with Initešub king of Carchemish (*PRU* 4, 154) reads as follows:

ri-kīl-ta ina be-ri ša ^{KUR IRI}*kar-ga-mis ... ma-a šum-ma-me-e* ¹*tam-*
kārī ša ma-an-da-ti ... i-du-ku-mi ù ¹*da-i-ku-šu-nu iṣ-ša-ba-tum-mi*
*... ú-šal-la-mu-ni ... 3 ma-na kaspa*¹
Accord between Carchemish ... if any merchant who is sent ... is
killed, and those who killed are captured, ... they shall pay ... 3
manas of silver for each one.

The international treaties protected merchants, guaranteed restitution of property, and paid compensation for damages, injury, or death.

Ugarit and the other coastal Canaanite cities and the cities of the Levant conducted business as usual under the protection of imperial Ḫattuša to whom they paid tribute. As Ḫattuša declined in power after the truce with Egypt in 1258 B.C.E., Carchemish ran the quotidian government of Syria. Ugarit's tribute still went to Ḫattuša, but Carchemish and adjacent areas traded with Ugarit. When Ugarit had border problems with its southern neighbor Siyannu-Ušnatu, Carchemish sent judges to settle the issues. Amurru and Kinza/Qadesh maintained independent correspondence and cooperation with Ugarit on a state level and expressed their connection through military accords and royal marriages. The Amorite city of Hamath participated in this culture of *pax* Ḫattuša and Levantine commercial interaction and later on, in the ninth century B.C.E., joined the coalition of states that resisted the invasion of the Assyrians.¹⁷³ Correspondence among the Levantine states dealt with the

¹⁷¹ Singer, "Political History of Ugarit," 658.

¹⁷² Heltzer, "Economy of Ugarit," 439.

¹⁷³ Buhl, "Hamath," 3:34.

regulation of the caravan routes through their territories and their disputed taxes and tariffs between Ḫatti and Egypt.¹⁷⁴

The nonimperial, Levantine treaty between Niqmepa of Alalakh and Ḫ-r^dIM of Tunip Seal of Ḫ-r^dIM, king of Tunip provides an example of a text sanctioned by an oath to the gods that established fair relations between neighboring states, as follows:

(1) Merchants need authorization to sell goods. (2) If someone plots against Ḫ-r^dIM, “you must not kill those men,” but (3) extradite plotters. (4) Seize booty. (5) Seize a fugitive and return him or her. (6) Produce a merchant to prove a sale of goods, if not, consider him a thief. (7) One who shaves off a “slavemark” you will consider a thief. (8) Procedure for robbery: victim must produce witnesses and swear an oath. (9) Do not detain families or individuals looking for sustenance. (10) Do not break an oath with the king of the Hurrians unless released by king. “Seal of Niqmepa, king of Alalakh. Whoever transgresses these agreements, Adad, Shamash the lord of judgment, Sin, and the great gods will make him perish.”¹⁷⁵

The following treaty of Abba-an of Yamkhad illustrates the structure of the Syrian treaty from the seventeenth century B.C.E.; it consists of the following: (1) list of cities, (2) history, (3) oath and sacrifice by sovereign, (4) stipulations, (5) list of parties, and (6) oath of cooperation. In the West Semitic style, it resembles a legal property document and judgment. Syria remained a collection of small kingdoms, and the ninth-century-B.C.E. treaty of Hiram of Tyre and David of Jerusalem resembles such a traditional Syrian treaty.

The small Levantine states engaged in trade, and their common trader (*kānaʿānī*) culture made agreements, contracts, and marriages with each other in order to promote their limited economies and to keep profitable goods moving along the trade routes. This prosperous but defenseless coastal region around Ugarit fell to the Greeks by the end of the thirteenth century B.C.E. As a scribe of Ugarit wrote, “Our city is sacked.”¹⁷⁶

The eighth-century-B.C.E. treaties from Syria represent the last set of coalitions and alliances enacted with ritual and sacrifice before the Neo-Assyrian hegemony.¹⁷⁷ They stipulate nonaggression, mutual support, and local concerns between two independent states before the *terminus ante quem* of 740 B.C.E. when Tiglath-pileser III conquered the region and incorporated it into the empire. Matiʿel or Matiʿilu king of Arpad, however, had made a previous treaty

¹⁷⁴ Singer, “Political History of Ugarit,” 674.

¹⁷⁵ Reiner, “Treaty,” 532.

¹⁷⁶ Singer, “Political History of Ugarit,” 726.

¹⁷⁷ McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, 99.

with Aššurnirari V in 754 B.C.E.¹⁷⁸ Keel's assertion about this treaty, that it "created a master-servant relationship that resembled metaphorically a father-son relationship"¹⁷⁹ illustrates that same logical error that Weber, Cross, Stager, and Schloen make in using a metaphor (patrimony) to define a relationship of a different category (servant).

The Aramaic treaty of Bar-Ga'yah, king of KTK with Mati'el of Arpad contains an introduction, a list of gods, treaty threats, and stipulations. Much like the treaties among Ugarit and its neighbors, it stipulates mutual defense pacts and the return of fugitives, for example: *whn y'th ḥd mlkn wysbny y'th ḥylk ʿly* (If one of the kings comes and surrounds me, then your army will come) (1.28–29); *whn yqrq mny ... wthšbhm ly* (and if someone flees from me ... then you will return them to me) (3.4–6).¹⁸⁰ The geographical list at the beginning of the eighth-century-B.C.E. Bar-ga'ayah of KTK and Mati'el of Arpad treaty in Aramaic reflects this Syrian system of independent states: *ʿm ʿrm klh* (with ʿAram).¹⁸¹ The pre-Neo-Assyrian city-states of the Levant, like the early neighbors of Ugarit, focused on trade treaties and contractual agreements among capable traders, who created an enviable economy.

3.11. *Levantine Trade Treaties vs. Imperial DH Covenant*

The Levantine intercity agreement that established "accord, negotiation, relationship, and holy place," according to McCarthy, resembles old monarchical texts in the DH and links it to the biblical concept of the *bərît*.¹⁸² Yet this term, *bərît*, in the DH refers to a covenant by military command of a universal and imperial god to conquer and to annihilate a neighboring population. It does not resemble the cooperative, local, business treaties of the trader Levant. Hence, these two categories of treaties do not have the same structure or purpose as McCarthy has assumed.

The attempt to find a common thread among ancient Near Eastern treaties can result in misunderstanding of the various forms. Thus Barré attempts to define a treaty as a "sworn political agreement between two nations under oath," witnessed by the gods of each nation as guarantors, and under threat of punishment for breaking of the agreement.¹⁸³ Within this definition he finds international treaties, either suzerainty or parity, and domestic or internal treaties. Logical problems with this categorization arise right away. For instance, imposed subjugation treaties of one dominant power over a smaller

¹⁷⁸ Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, 18–20. Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 3), 246.

¹⁷⁹ Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems*, 507 (my translation).

¹⁸⁰ Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, 50–51, 136–37.

¹⁸¹ McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, 98–101; Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, 42–43.

¹⁸² McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, 19–20.

¹⁸³ Barré, "Treaties in the ANE," 6:653.

power differ from contractual parity agreements between equals. Domestic covenants of loyalty to a common king or a god do not involve two nations.¹⁸⁴

3.12. *Hypotheses*

Two methodological assumptions about history and myth guide this inquiry. First, Ugarit, Jerusalem, and the other city-states of the Levant shared a common territorial, business, and cultural network. Ugarit, however, cannot serve as a matrix for the entire Levant or for Canaan but can, with its wealth of literature and written records, provide clues to the predeuteronomistic world of the Levant. Second, the myths and legends of Ugarit reflect a depiction of the relationships among the gods and the royal family. Ugaritic and Canaanite religion may have significant differences, but the lack of evidence for Canaanite religion and the common Levantine environment allow for hypothesis of some common characteristics. The evidence that does exist indicates significant correlations between the two religions.

The findings of the chapter included a triadic family social matrix that may provide a more accurate picture of the common Levantine relationships among the gods, the kings, their families, and their citizens. Two synonymous Ugaritic terms characterize this relationship: *ʾummatu* and *šaphu*. Power and authority began with the triadic divine family: the god ʾIlu, the goddess ʾAthiratu, and their children, followed by the king, the royal family, and the families to the lowest levels of slave society, who shared the same triadic structure as the divine family. No institution of *nabîʾim* intervened between the king and the god and the people.

The myths and legends of Ugarit differ from the deuteronomistic myth of obedience to one god, the code of instructions, and the *nabîʾim*. The legend of Kirta (*krt*) reveals a society in which ultimate authority appears to rest with the god ʾIlu and with the human king Kirta. The goddess ʾAthirat of Tyre and Sidon does not play the role of consort or wife of ʾIlu or of Baʿlu, as DH scholarship imagines, but has an independent status and plays an independent role in the drama. The Ugaritic epic-myth-story of *Aqhat*, like that of Kirta, concerns the problems of a royal family and its relationships with each other and with the gods. The Baʿlu myth revolves around the issues of households and authority among the gods.

This study thus proposes the following hypotheses concerning Ugaritic, and thus Levantine, myth and religion: No imperial one god or patriarch controls the universe. No human beings play a significant part in the lives of the gods. The gods have familial relationships with each other. No written code of instruction imposes conquest or a cult of obedience and conquest on the gods. The Ugaritic myths bring out a triadic family social matrix that ap-

¹⁸⁴ Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, 57.

pear more plausible than a *bêl ʿab* patriarchal paradigm. Thus the gods of the Levant differed in many significant ways in their own characteristics, and in their relationships with human beings, from the YHWH of the DH.

The imperial dyadic, master-servant hierarchy resembles the *bīt ardi* political relationships envisioned in the deuteronomistic covenant and the *bīt ardi* / *arad ardi* structure. The DH refers to both Moses and David as *ʿebed* YHWH. The mythical and political worlds of Ugarit, however, did not revolve around a covenant of obedience, extermination, and punishment.

Concerning the deuteronomistic element of warfare, Ugaritic myth and legend can offer the brief conquest narrative that introduces the warrior maiden ʿAnatu. Ugaritic myth and legend have no trace of imperial aggression, demands for obedience, conquest, extermination of populations, and punishments for disobedience.

Concerning the deuteronomistic element of punishment for disobedience, the gods of Ugarit lived and died in their personal struggles but held no concept of punishment by death or exile for disobedience to a command for extermination. Aqhatu died for his insult to the goddess ʿAnatu. The gods and the small states of the Levant endeavored to protect each other's property, persons, and trade. The Levantine treaties of alliance, cooperation, mutual defense against aggression, and protection of property and trade resemble the lives of the gods but do not resemble the imperial deuteronomistic covenant.

Given the preponderance of this evidence for the differences between the intertwined triadic and dyadic small city-kingdom culture of Ugarit and the imperial, dyadic Deuteronomistic covenant, this study proposes that the deuteronomistic covenant could not have developed from the local Canaanite culture that Jerusalem shared with its neighbors in the Levant. Some scholars claim that the Deuteronomistic covenant had its origin in the empire of Hattuša, and this study will investigate that proposal in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4: DEUTERONOMISTIC COVENANT AND HITTITE TREATIES

Because George E. Mendenhall proposed that the form of the covenant evident in the book of Deuteronomy derived from the Hittite empire and its subjugation treaties, this study looks next at the Hittite empire. Mendenhall argued that the treaties of Šuppiluliuma I, Muršili II, and Muwatalli II (ca. 1344–1271 B.C.E.) resembled the covenant in the book of Deuteronomy. This study will review, first, the scholarship concerning Mendenhall's proposal and other studies that relate the DH to the Hittites. In order to get behind the religious presuppositions of the treaties, this study looks, second, at the religion of the Hittites. Third, in order to understand the presuppositions of imperialist war evident in the treaties, this study analyzes the annals and war reports. Fourth, in order to get a sense of the purpose and function of the Hittite subjugation treaties, this study looks at the treaties within a much wider scope than that analyzed by Mendenhall and others. The chapter finishes with a comparison of the Hittite ideological worldview and the deuteronomistic covenant.

4.1. *Survey of the Scholarship*

The argument put forward by George E. Mendenhall and Gary Herion that the book of Deuteronomy follows the literary form of the Hittite subjugation treaties has found general acceptance among scholars.¹⁸⁵ The treaties of the Hittite kings, Šuppiluliuma I, Muršili II, and Muwatalli II (ca. 1344–1271 B.C.E.) resemble the structure of the covenant form of Deuteronomy and include the following elements: (1) introduction of speaker, (2) historical prologue, (3) stipulations, (4) statement about document, (5) divine witnesses, (6) and curses for noncompliance and blessings for compliance.¹⁸⁶ Mendenhall and Herion present the concept of covenant as “an agreement enacted between two parties in which one or both make promises under oath”¹⁸⁷ and as “common property” of the ancient Near East.¹⁸⁸ According to Mendenhall, the code of obedience in Joshua 24 (Josh 24:2–4, 14–15) represented an actual historical event in Shechem in which the tribes ratified their union by means of the ritual recitations from the shoulders of mounts Ebal and Gerizim (Deut 27:11–26), and the covenant idea of obedience to YHWH emerged with the formation of the state as an adaptation of a centuries-old pattern from the Late Bronze Hittite world.¹⁸⁹ Mendenhall identifies the oracle of 2 Samuel 7 as a promise to David that indicated a new tribal covenant in

¹⁸⁵ Mendenhall and Herion, “Covenant,” 1179.

¹⁸⁶ Hoffner, “Hittites,” 145.

¹⁸⁷ Mendenhall and Herion, “Covenant,” 1:1179, 1183.

¹⁸⁸ Mendenhall, “Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition,” 50–76.

¹⁸⁹ Mendenhall and Herion, “Covenant,” 1:1182–89.

which YHWH bound himself by oath to a king. According to Mendenhall, the Deuteronomic covenant represented the “ethical world” of the Hittite treaties because they exhibited “transcendent moral or ethical foundations for the suzerain-vassal relationship.”

The Hittite kings had used the treaty documents to formalize and to regulate political relations with their foreign counterparts, and Mendenhall likened the historical introduction in Deuteronomy chapters 1–4 to the historical prologue of the Hittite treaty formula, which had provided information about Hittite history and previous relations between the Hittites and their treaty subjects.¹⁹⁰ From these literary parallels, Mendenhall speculated about second millennium B.C.E. contact between Ḫattuša and Jerusalem and further identified the Deuteronomic treaty form as a common treaty form of the ancient Near East.¹⁹¹

Other studies link the DH to the Hittites. Studies in linguistics find parallels between DH language and common Hittite culture words, such as the following: wine (*wiyanash* / *yayin*), helmet (*kubaḫish* / *kôbaʿ*), sesame (*shapshama* / *šumšôm*), oak (*allan* / *ʿallôn*), glaze (*zapzigi* / *sipsîgîm*), idol (*tarpish* / *tērāpîm*).¹⁹² Hoffner finds as well that the central covenant vocabulary—such as *ʾāhab* (love) and *yādaʿ* (know)—links Deuteronomy to the Hittite treaties.¹⁹³ Hoffner thus connected the *ha-ḫitî* and *ha-ḫitîm* (Hittites) of the DH in Canaan of the seventh-century-B.C.E. to the Hittites of Anatolia of the second millennium B.C.E. and proposed that the form of the international treaties between the governments of Ḫattuša and various Syrian city-kingdoms of the Late Bronze Age, up to 1180 B.C.E., had found their way into Jerusalem in the eighth or seventh century B.C.E. through the Neo-Hittite states.¹⁹⁴ Other studies conflated the two groups: the sons of Ḫeth (*bānê ḫet*) and men of Ḫatti (*ha-ḫittîm*) (Josh 1:4; 1 Kgs 10:29).¹⁹⁵ Some archaeological evidence supports the idea of the migration of Hittites from Anatolia through the Neo-Hittite states to the Levant during the twelfth century B.C.E.¹⁹⁶

Other modern scholars have explored the broader relationships among the treaty forms and covenant formulas of the ancient Near East. According to

¹⁹⁰ Gurney, “Hittite Empire,” 151–65.

¹⁹¹ Mendenhall and Herion, “Covenant,” 1:1183.

¹⁹² Hoffner, “Hittites,” 153–54; Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*, 90–102, 154–56; Hoffner, “Some Contributions of Hittitology”; Mayer, “Die Hethiter und das Alte Testament”; Kitchen, *Bible in Its World*; Kempinski, “Hittites in the Bible”; Beal, “Hittites after the Empire’s Fall”; McCarter, “Apology of David,” 489–504; Tsevat, “Two Old Testament Stories,” 321–26.

¹⁹³ Hoffner, “Hittite-Israelite Cultural Parallels,” xxix–xxxiv.

¹⁹⁴ Idem, “Hittites,” 152.

¹⁹⁵ McMahon, “Hittites in the OT,” *ABD* 3:232.

¹⁹⁶ Kempinski, “Hittites in the Bible?” 20–45; Forrer, “Hittites in Palestine,” 190–203; Hoffner, “Some Contributions of Hittitology,” 27–55; Mayer, “Die Hethiter und das Alte Testament,” 65–73; Beal, “Hittites after the Empire’s Fall,” 28–37; Gurney, *Hittites*, 1–11, 47–50.

McCarthy, the *bərît* covenant of Deuteronomy fits into the international treaties of the Levant and the Canaanite-Phoenician world of Jerusalem.¹⁹⁷ The vocabulary of the Hittite treaty form might have borrowed its term for treaty (*riksu/rikiltu*) from the Assyrians. The Assyrians later borrowed the Aramaic term *adê* to represent their imperial treaties. Weinfeld finds that the international character of the Hittite covenant parallels the international expressions of covenant in Deuteronomy.¹⁹⁸ According to Brinkman, the Deuteronomic covenant fits into the genre of international treaty in a broad generic sense that includes détente treaties between empires, subjugation treaties with weaker countries, and internal loyalty oaths.¹⁹⁹

Deuteronomy may fit into the configuration, worldview, and speech of the Hittite treaties from the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C.E., according to Keel. The Hittite treaties with historical review, basic principles, specifications, and blessings and curses appear to correspond to those of Deuteronomy. The covenant of loyalty of the Aramaic and Levantine states to the Assyrians, however, appear closer in time to the Deuteronomist than do the Hittite treaties, and Keel views Deuteronomic passages (Deut 13:7–12 and 28:20–44) rather as Aramaic Levantine treaties to Assyria.²⁰⁰

This present study finds that the arguments for the derivation of the treaty form of Deuteronomy from the treaties of the Hittites or from a common ancient Near Eastern source rest on formal literary grounds with little relation to history. Studies that link the DH to international treaty forms illustrate one of the problems in Mendenhall's theory: they do not explain why a local Canaanite god would impose an international subjugation treaty on his own people rather than on the target population. In order to get a better sense of the possible relationship between the treaty ideology of the Hittite empire and that of the DH, this study proposes to learn more about the religion, the warfare, and the function of the imperial treaty. What purpose did it serve? What presuppositions does it make about the nature of the god, the imperial agenda, the gods' relationship with the subjects, and the idea of legal conquest under the authority of the gods?

4.2. Religion of Hattuša

The people of Hattuša paid allegiance and devotion to the sun-goddess of Arinna and the storm-god of Heaven/Hattuša. An Old Hittite ritual identifies the two gods as the head gods of the state pantheon: "To me, to the king, have the gods, the sun-god [of Arinna] and the weather-god, given the land

¹⁹⁷ McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, 1.

¹⁹⁸ Weinfeld, "Common Heritage," 191, 177.

¹⁹⁹ Brinkman, "Political Covenants," 81–111.

²⁰⁰ Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems*, 580.

and my house.”²⁰¹ The large pantheon of gods of Ḫattuša combines the indigenous Hattic tradition with the conquering *nesite* (from Neša = Kaneš = Hittite) tradition.²⁰² The imperial state pantheon of Ḫattuša also consisted of the Hurrian dynastic gods from Mitanni.²⁰³ Adopted under Queen Puduhepa, the royal Hurrian pantheon consisted of fifty gods, including the divine couple Tešub and Hapat, who resided at the sanctuary of Yazılıkaya on the outskirts of the city Ḫattuša.²⁰⁴ The inclusive imperial religion of Ḫattuša gathered the thousand gods from their Indo-European roots, from the native Ḫattu people, from western Anatolia, and from the Hurrians of Mitanni.²⁰⁵ The lists of the thousand gods in the treaties attest to the expansion of the empire and the inclusion of the oath-gods of the subject countries.²⁰⁶ The treaty of Šuppiluliuma I with Šattiwaza of Mitanni lists the full imperial state pantheon,²⁰⁷ which in Mitanni included the Indic deities Mitra, Varuna, Indra, and Nasatyas.²⁰⁸ This present study suggests that Ḫattuša’s expanding pantheon indicates that it had an inclusive religion, and that the major gods did not order the destruction of their competing local subordinate gods but instead brought them into the imperial family.

The treaty of Šuppiluliuma I with Ḫaqqanāš and the People of Ḫayaša in northeastern Anatolia contains an exemplary long list of the wide range of imperial and local gods included as witnesses to the legal arrangement by conquest, as follows:²⁰⁹

§ 6 (38) *nu-ut-ta ka-a-ša ki-e ud-da-a-ar* ŠA.PAL NI.IŠ DINGIR^{LIM} (39) *te-eḫ-ḫu-un nu ka-a-ša ki-e-da-ni ud-da-ni-i LI.IM* DINGIR^{MES} (40) *tu-li-ia ḫal-zi-u₂-en* (§ 7, 41) ^dUTU ŠA.ME.E ^dUTU ^{URU}A-ri-in-na ^dU ŠA.ME.E ^dIM ^{URU}Ha-at-ti (42) ^dIM ^{URU}Ha-la-ap ^dIM ^{URU}TUL₂-na ^dIM ^{URU}Z[i-i]p-pa-la-an-da (43) ^dIM ^{URU}Ša-pi₂-nu-ua ^dIM ^{URU}Ne-ri-iq ^dIM [^{URU}Hi-]š-ša-aš-ḫa-pa ^dU ^{URU}Ša-aḫ-pi₂-na (44) ^dU KI.KAL. BAD ^dU KI.LAM ^dU ^{URU}U-da ^dU ^{URU}[Ki-iz-z]u-ua-at-na (45) ^dU [^{URU}]Pit₂-te-ia-ri-ik ^dU ^{URU}Ša-[mu-ḫa ^dU ^{URU}Ša-]ri-iš-ša ^dU ^{URU}Hur-ma (46) ^dU ^{URU}Li-iḫ-zi-na ^dU TIL₂ ^dU [^{URU}... -n]a ^dU ^{URU}Hu-ul-la-aš-ša (47) ^dHe₂-pit₂ ^{URU}U-da ^dHe₂-pit ^{URU}Ki-iz-zu[-ua-at]-na (§ 8, 48) ^dLAMA ^dLAMA ^{URU}Ha-at-ti ^dZi-it-ḫa-ri-ia-aš ^dKar-ai-iš (49) ^dHa-pa-an-da-li-ia-aš ^dLAMA ^{URU}Ga-ra-aḫ-na ^dLAM[A LIL₂] ^dLAMA ^{KUŠ}kur-ša-aš (50) ^dA-a-aš ^dIŠTAR ^dIŠTAR LIL₂ ^dIŠTAR ^{URU}Ni-nu-ua ^d[IŠTAR ^{URU}]Ha-at-ta-ri-na

²⁰¹ Taracha, “Zur Entwicklung des offiziellen Pantheons,” 89.

²⁰² Gonnet, “Hittite Religion,” 3:225.

²⁰³ Taracha, “Zur Entwicklung des offiziellen Pantheons,” 92.

²⁰⁴ Gonnet, “Hittite Religion,” 3:225.

²⁰⁵ Houwink ten Cate, “Hittite History,” 3:224.

²⁰⁶ Taracha, “Zur Entwicklung des offiziellen Pantheons,” 92.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 95.

²⁰⁸ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 38.

²⁰⁹ Friedrich, “Der Vertrag des Šuppiluliumaš,” 110–13.

(51) ^dIŠTAR SAL.LUGAL ŠA.ME.E ^dNi-na-at-ta-aš ^d[Ku-li-i]t-ta-aš
^dZA.BA₄.BA₄ (52) ^dZA.BA₄.BA₄ ^{URU}El-la-ia ^dZA.BA₄.BA₄ ^{URU}A[r-zi-ia
DIN]GIR^{MEŠ} KI.KAL.BAD (53) ^{hu-u-ma-an-te-eš} ^dMARDUK ^dAL.LA.TUM
tag₂-na-a-[aš ^dUTU-uš ^{URU}] ^{hu-pu₂-iš-na-aš} (54) ^dHu-ua-aš-ša-an-
na-aš ^{URU}Ša-mu-ḥa-aš ^dA-a-[pa-ra-aš ^{URU}Hur-ma-aš] ^{URU}Ha-an-ti-ta-
aš-šu-uš (55) ^{URU}An-ku-ua-aš ^dKa-taḥ-ḥa-aš ^{URU}Ta-ḥur-p[a-aš ^dMa-
am-ma-aš ^{URU}] ^{Ka-ta-pa-aš} SAL.LUGAL-aš (56) ^{URU}Du-un-na-aš ^dḤal-
la-ra-aš DINGIR^{MEŠ} Lu-[la-aḥ-ḥa-e-eš DINGIR^{MEŠ} ^{Ha-pi₂]-ri-e-eš} (57)
DINGIR^{MEŠ} ^{ša} ^{URU}Ha-at-ti ^{hu-u-ma-an-te-eš} DIN[GIR^{MEŠ} ...] KUR-e-aš
(58) DINGIR^{MEŠ} ŠA.ME.E DINGIR^{MEŠ} IR.ŠI.TIM ḤUR.SAG^{MEŠ} ID₂^{MEŠ}
TUL₂^{MEŠ} UR.PI₂^{MEŠ} ^{ne-pi₂[-iš]} (59) ^{te-e-kan₂ šal-li-iš a-a-ru-na-aš na-}
^{a[t ku-ur-ru-e-eš a-ša-an-du]} [rest of column broken off]

§ 6 (38) I have now placed these words under oath for you, and we have now summoned the thousand gods (*LI.IM* DINGIR^{MEŠ}) to assembly in this matter. (§ 7, 41) The sun-god of heaven, the sun-goddess of Arinna, the storm-god of heaven, the storm-god of Ḥatti, the storm-god of Aleppo, the storm-god of Arinna, the storm-god of Zippalanda, the storm-god of Sapinuwa, the storm-god of Nerik, the storm-god of Hisashapa, the storm-god of Sahpina, the storm-god of the Army, the storm-god of the Market, the storm-god of Uda, the storm-god of Kizzuwatna, the storm-god of Pittiyarik, the storm-god of Samuḥa, [the storm-god] of Sarissa, the storm-god of Ḥurma, the storm-god of Liḥzina, the storm-god of the ruin mound, the storm-god of [...], the storm-god of Ḥalusa, Ḥebat of Uda, Ḥebat of Kizzuwatna. (§ 8, 48) The protective god, the protective god of Ḥatti, Zithariya, Karzi, Ḥapantaliya, the protective god of Karahna, the protective god of the countryside, the protective god of the *kurša*, Ayaš, Ištar, Ištar of the countryside, Ištar of Nineveh, [Ištar] of Ḥattarina, Ištar queen of heaven, Ninatta, Kulitta, the war-god, the war-god of Illaya, the war-god [of Arziya], all the gods of the army, Marduk, Allatu, [the sun-goddess] of the Earth, Ḥuwas-sanna of Ḥupisna, Ayabara of Samuḥa, Ḥantitassu [of Ḥurma] Kataḥḥa of Ankuwa, [Ammamma] of Taḥurpa, the Queen of Katapa, Ḥallara of Dunna, the [mountain-dweller] gods, the [mercenary] gods, all the gods of Ḥatti, the gods [] of the land, the gods of heaven, the gods of the earth, the mountains, [the rivers, the springs, the clouds], heaven, the earth, the great sea. They [shall be witnesses]. [gap]

The royal religion of Ḥattuša also focused on the great king at the core and from that core permeated Hittite society. This royal religion may reflect a spirit of syncretism in the invading imperial military culture of the Hittites

with the indigenous religion of Hatti Land at the beginning of the second millennium B.C.E.²¹⁰ In that Old Anatolian tradition, the word for kingdom (*ḥaššuwnatar*) derived from the root of the verb to rule (*ḥaššuwnizziya*), and the noun king (*ḥaššu-*) and the noun queen (*ḥaššušara-*) derived from the verb to procreate (*ḥaš*, related to the noun *ḥatti-*).²¹¹ This etymological aspect of the name of the kingdom thus suggests an ancient connection of the royal family and its procreation to the religion and to the gods. This early history may adumbrate the ongoing Hittite empire characterized by its mixture of imperial conquest, extended royal family, and inclusive pantheon.

The great king (emperor) ruled by divine right and functioned in the hierarchy as the highest priest and judge of the land and the empire.²¹² The Apology of Hattušili III, which constitutes a justification of the king's actions to the goddess Ištar, identifies the king as the servant of the goddess Ištar.²¹³ The expression "My Sun" expressed the concept of royal power as divine power.²¹⁴ Although the great king served the goddess Ištar, the sun-goddess of Arinna and the storm-god of Heaven chose the king, and the king had a contractual relationship with the gods to fulfill the obligations of the cult.²¹⁵ The gods chose the king according to the religion, but the king chose his own successor.²¹⁶ Attempts, such as that of Telepinu, to implement the king's office as a patrimonial institution with patrilinear succession thus ended in failure and usurpation because they offended both the religious and royal institutions. The king acted in the ambiguous capacity, similar to that of the king of Ugarit, as both the descendant of the divine couple and as the servant of the storm-god.²¹⁷ In this tradition, the storm-god and the sun-goddess fuse into one with the king, and the king becomes "My Sun": "As their soul and their heart become one, so should that of the sun-god of the gods and that of Labarna their soul and their heart become one." The king, however, did not attain the status of divinity until he died and became a god.

The royal family had close relationships with the gods. The sun-goddess of Arinna chose Hattušili I, led him into battle, and returned with war-booty for her temple. The royal couple performed ritual roles at the main New Year festival. The sun-goddess protected the royal couple as Tabarna the Great King and Tawananna the Great Queen. The king and queen functioned as chief priest and priestess of the cult. The royal cult resembled the basic house cult with family gods, and the altar of the temple resembled the hearth

²¹⁰ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 89–106.

²¹¹ Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. I must rely on the work of translators for Hittite words and passages.

²¹² Hoffner, "Hittites," 140.

²¹³ Van den Hout, "Apology of Hattušili III (1.77)," 1:199–204.

²¹⁴ Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, 323.

²¹⁵ Gonnet, "Hittite Religion," 3:225.

²¹⁶ Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, 325.

²¹⁷ Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 189.

of the house.²¹⁸ The nobility consisted of the great family, the *pankuš*, of the king and held the highest appointee positions of rule among the grant kingdoms and peripheral cities.²¹⁹ Although the king had power by divine right, however, the state required the consensus of that same nobility, the king's extended family, to operate. Since the nobility funded the military campaigns with soldiers and supplies from their estates, the king's power depended on their loyalty and consensus. The king repaid the nobility for their support from war-booty out of his conquests.²²⁰

Hittite imperial ideology emphasized conquest as service to the gods, the danger of offending them, and the problems associated with royal patrimony. Ḫattuša equated the king with the gods,²²¹ but at the same time, the king served the storm-god.²²² Although the king ruled, the gods caused things, and the Prayer of Muršili II reflects the concept of divine causality.²²³ In his prayer Muršili II accepted the sin of his father Šuppiluliuma I, who had violated the oath of allegiance to his brother the king, as the cause of the plague that decimated the Ḫatti homeland for a generation.²²⁴ Service and loyalty to a god deserved reward and protection from that god, as Ḫattušili III had served the goddess Šaušga by usurping the patrimonial succession of Urḫi-Tešub. Ḫattušili III and Šaušga usurped the principle of patrimony for the imperial principle of service (*arad ardi*) to a god as the qualification for the office of great king. The thousand gods of the oath protected the imperial relationship of loyalty and service, such as that of the bronze tablet: "These gods of the oath will destroy you."²²⁵

Service to the gods of Ḫattuša included the conquest of land and the gathering of plunder to devote to the gods. The Text of Labarna illustrates this principle of plunder and redistribution in the service of the sun goddess of Arinna, as follows:

(4) *nu-uš-ma-aš pa-ra-a ne-ia-an-ta-an* (5) *tar-ḫu-u-i-li-in* ^{GIŠ}ŠI.KAK
pa-iš (6) *a-ra-aḫ-ze₂-na-an-ua* ŠA ^{LU₂}KUR₂ KUR.KUR^{TI M} (7) *la-ba-ar-*
na-aš ki-iš šar-az (8) *ḫar-ki-ia-it-ta-ru- a-aš-šu-ma* (9) KUBABBAR
 GUŠKIN *an-da* ^{URU}ḫu-at-tu-ši (10) ^{URU}*a-ri-in-na ši-u₂-na-an* URU-aš
 (11) *pid₂-da-a-an-du*

Nun hast du ihnen einen ... mächtigen Speer gegeben (mit dem Auftrag): "Die umliegenden Feindesländer sollen durch die hand

²¹⁸ Ibid., 249.

²¹⁹ Hoffner, "Hittites," 142.

²²⁰ Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, 327.

²²¹ Ibid., 327, 329, 354.

²²² Ünal, "Studien," 72.

²²³ McMahon, "Hittite Texts and Literature," 3:230.

²²⁴ Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 206.

²²⁵ Kuhrt, "Hittites," 265.

des Labarna vernichtet werden. Kostbare Habe aber, Silber (und) Gold, sollen sie der Stadt Ḫattuša (und) Arinna, den Gottesstädten, (als Tribut) entrichten.²²⁶

The gods of Ḫattuša demanded destruction of the resident populations if they resisted the army of the king. In the case of resistance, the army of the king destroyed the kingdom and deported the survivors to the Ḫatti homeland as slaves. The king dedicated the plunder to the temples, and the temples redistributed it to the owners of the estates, who had paid for the wars.²²⁷

According to the following bilingual Annals of Ḫattušili I (1650–1620 B.C.E.), the conquering kings put the conquered lands under the tutelage of the sun-god and carried the gods of the foreign nations into Ḫattuša:

(Akkadian Obv. 1) LUGAL.GAL *tabarna ina* ^{URU}KUBABBAR-ti LUGAL-utta *itepuš* ... (3:17) (17) ^{URU}Ullumma *uhalliq-su-ma* ... *attašar-šu* ... (21) *ana* ^{URU}Sallahiuwa *ittalak* ^{URU}Sallahiuwa *šū-ma išātam* (22) *ittadin u šunu ana* IR₃. MEŠ-ti-ya *itturu* ... (24) LUGAL.GAL *libba-šu uttappiš* (25) *ana qinnat* KUR. HI.A ^dUTU *ittaz*. ... (Rev. 1) (1) [*ina* KUR.HI.A] ^dUTU *ittaz*[i]z LUGAL.GAL [*ta*]barna (2) [*ana* ^{URU}Zipišn]a *allik-ma u* ^{URU}Haḫ[h]i *kima* UR.MAḪ (3) [*attana*]klamu-šu ^{URU}Zipišna *uhalliq*.²²⁸
(Hittite, I:1) [LUGAL.GAL *tabar*]na ^mḪattušili LUGAL.GAL (2) [LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Haḫ]ti LU₂ ^{URU}Kuššar KUR ^{URU}Ḫatti (3) [LUGAL-e(zz)ia]t ... (36) ^{URU}Ulman *ḫarninkun* ... (42) nu *ina* KUR ^{URU}Šallahšuwa *pāun nu-za* KUR ^{URU}Šallahšuwa (43) IZI-it *apašila kattan tarnaš apūš-ma-mu* (44) IR₃.MEŠ-ni *waḫnuir* ... (48) *nu-za* LUGAL.GAL (49) [ZI-an *warši*]yanunun *nu-kan* SA KUR. KUR.MEŠ (50) [EGIR-panda ^dU]TU(!)-u[š] *tiyat*. ... (52) ŠA₃ KUR.KUR.MEŠ (53) *anda* ^dUTU-uš *tiyat* (54) LUGAL.GAL *tabarnaš ina* ^{URU}Zippašna (55): [*p*]āun (Rev. 1) ^{URU}Haḫḫan-ma-za-kan UR.MAḪ *maḫḫan* (2) *arḫa tarkuwalliškinun* (3) nu ^{URU}Zippaššanan *ḫarninkun*.²²⁹
(Akkadian, Obv. 1) The great king Tabarna exercised kingship in Ḫatti ... (3:17) I destroyed Ullumma. ... (18) I expropriated it.²³⁰ ... (21) I went to Sallahsuwa, Sallahsuwa itself, (22) kindled a fire.

²²⁶ Ibid.; translated by Ehelolf, "Text of Labarna," 175; cuneiform text in Archi, *Hethitische Briefe und Texte verschiedenen Inhalts*; KUB 57.63, ii 6–14, 48–49. "Now have you given to them a powerful spear with the commission: 'The surrounding enemy lands should be destroyed by the hand of Labarna. Precious possessions, however, silver and gold, must they pay to the city of Ḫattuša and Arinna, the cities of the gods, (as tribute)'" [my translation of Ehelolf].

²²⁷ Ünal, "Studien," 72.

²²⁸ Melchert, "Acts of Ḫattušili I," 7–19.

²²⁹ Ibid.

²³⁰ Houwink ten Cate, "History of Warfare," 48.

They became my subjects. ... (4:24) I destroyed the city of Sanhwitta, and the surrounding countryside came under the protection of the sun-god.²³¹ (Rev. 1–3) I, the great king Tabarna, went to Zippasna ... and destroyed Zippasna. [Its gods I brought up to the sun-goddess of Arinna.]

The army (ERIN₂.MEŠ) thus conquers lands and brings plunder to the temple of the sun-goddess, and victory in war constitutes divine justification. Hattušili I's War Report upholds the religious motivation for conquest: "I consecrated it to the weather-god and declared it sacrosanct" where sacrosanct means "destroyed and uninhabitable."²³²

The Ten-Year Annals of Muršili II (1321–1295 B.C.E.) describe the sun-goddess of Arinna, who "ran before the army in battle" and assured the success of the king's endeavor to serve the goddess.²³³ The Annals continue with the tales of "my lady," the sun-goddess of Arinna, whom Muršili II serves and to whom he brings plunder and transplanted population by the thousands, as the following excerpt illustrates:²³⁴

(1) [UM-MA ^dUTU]^š ¹Mur-ši-li LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR *Ha-at-ti* UR.SAG ... (21) *nu A-NA ŠA ^dUTU ^{URU}A-ri-in-na-pit₂ GAŠAN-IA SAG.UŠ-aš A-NA EZEN.ĤI.A EGIR-an ti-ia-nu-un* (22) *na-aš-za i-ia-nu-un* ... (27) *nu-mu ^dUTU ^{URU}A-ri-in-na me-mi-an iš-ta-ma-aš-ta na-aš-mu kat-ta-an ti-ia-at* (28) *nu-zu-kan₂ A-NA ^{GIŠ}GU.ZA A-BI-IA ku-ua-pi₂ e-eš-ḥa-at nu-za ki-e a-ra-aḥ-ze₂-na-aš* (29) KUR.KUR.MEŠ ^{LU₂}KUR₂ *I-NA MU 10.KAM tar-aḥ-ḥu-un na-at-kan₂ ku-e-nu-un* (30) ŠA KUR ^{URU}Tur₂-mi-it-ta-mu ^{URU}Ka₃-aš-ka₂-aš *ku-u-ru-ri-ia-aḥ-ta* ... (32) *nu-uš-ši ^dUTU^š pa-a-un nu ŠA ^{URU}Ka₃-aš-ka₃ ku-i-e-eš SAG.DU.MEŠ KUR.KUR.MEŠ ^{URU}Ha-li-la-aš* (33) ^{URU}Du-ud-du-uš-ka₃-aš-ša *e-šir na-aš gul-un na-aš IŠ-TU NAM.RA GUD.ĤI.A UDU.ĤI.A* (34) [^š]a-ra-a da-aḥ-ḥu-un na-aš ^{URU}KUBABBAR-ši *ar-ḥa u₂-da-aḥ-ḥu-un* (35) [^{URU}Ha]-li-la-an-ma ^{URU}Du-ud-du-uš-ka₃-an-na *ar-ḥa ua-ar-nu-nu-un* ... (38) *nu-mu ^dUTU ^{URU}A-ri-in-na* (39) [GAŠAN-IA] ^dU NIR.GAL₂ EN-IA ^dMe-iz-zu-ul-la-aš DINGIR.MEŠ *ḥu-u-ma-an-te-eš pi₂-ra-an ju-i-e-ir*.

1. [The Word of the Sun], Muršiliš, the great king of Hatti-Land, the hero, ... (21) I performed the regular festivals of the sun-goddess of Arinna, my lady. ... (27) The sun-goddess of Arinna heard my words and stood by me. (28) Thus I vanquished, as soon as I took the throne of my father, these enemy (29) foreign lands in

²³¹ Melchert, "Acts of Hattušili I," 14. Houwink ten Cate, "History of Warfare," 47–52; *Annals of Hattušili I*, Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazkoï 30.

²³² Ünal, "Studien," 74.

²³³ Beal, "Ten Year Annals," 2:82.

²³⁴ Götze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*, 14–77.

ten years and destroyed them. (30) The Kaška people of Turmitta came for battle against me. ... (32) Then I, the Sun, moved out against them. I attacked the capital cities of the Kaška land: Ḫalila (33) and Dudduška. I looted their troops, cattle, and sheep (34) and brought them away to Ḫattuša. (35) I burned down Ḫalila and Dudduška. (38) The sun-goddess of Arinna, the proud weather-god, my lord, Mezzullaš, and all the gods stood by me.²³⁵

The land of Ḫattuša and the land conquered by the army of Ḫattuša thus belonged to the storm-god, who appointed the king as administrator and regent of the land.²³⁶

The religion of the thousand gods played an important role in the protection treaties and the international relationships of Ḫattuša. In order to avoid imminent destruction, the subjugated cities agreed to the terms of the treaties for their own protection and to the divine sanction by oath before the images of the gods.²³⁷ The treaties' list of gods included the gods of both countries involved so that the subordinate rulers, caught between destruction and protection, would feel obligated to their own gods as well to the coercion of the Hittites.²³⁸ In the Hittite ideology, the binding (*išhiul*) referred to the stipulations and to the oath to the gods, who made the relationship binding on both sides. The divine witnesses threatened to destroy a subject for an evil action: "If some Hittite undertakes evil against me ... and you hide it from me, ... you will transgress the oath ... and these gods will destroy you."²³⁹ Even though the parties swore by the thousand gods, which included their local gods, the booty and the prisoners became the property of the sun-goddess and the storm-god.²⁴⁰

Divine favor depended on past action, and the legal/historical prologues of the treaties expressed the king's need to justify his aggressive actions to the gods from past relationships. According to the Annals, the Hittite armies required the aid of the sun-goddess of Arinna to succeed in battle. Such divine favor did not depend on obedience to a code of instruction but on past actions of loyalty and obedience, which influenced the gods, who in turn intervened in history: the goddess Ištar of Šamuha caused events by divine power or justice (*para ḫandandatar*). This concept of intertwining history, divine

²³⁵ Beal, "Ten Year Annals," 2:84; Götze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*, 15–23.

²³⁶ Hoffner, "Hittites," 139–40.

²³⁷ Altman, "Rethinking the Hittite System," 747.

²³⁸ Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, 358.

²³⁹ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 26–34; CTH 42; Friedrich, "Der Vertrag des Šuppiluliumaš," 103–63.

²⁴⁰ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 88.

intervention, causality, and legal justification constitutes a major theme in Hittite religion, annals, and treaties.²⁴¹

In the historical prologue, the authors of a Hittite treaty imagined an assembly of gods as divine judges in a divine court, and the prologue served the function of a legal prologue designed to persuade the divine court to acknowledge the king's actions and thus to grant him the divine sanction and justification for imposing his rule on a country. Subjugation treaties required divine justification as requested in the legal prologue. The legal prologue justified the Hittite king's claim of ownership and rule after the submission of a foreign king. The subordinate king, who avoided a full conquest and destruction and thereby kept his throne, swore the oath by his own gods in order to acknowledge the facts of the submission and to legitimate the conquest in the eyes of the gods of both sides. This legal procedure protected the Hittite king from charges of trespass against his neighbors in the divine court.²⁴² The royal religion of Ḫattuša mandated conquest, regulated international treaties, and thus shaped both the religious and the legal, military, political, and international life of the nation.

Thus in the following passage, Muršili II enlists the imperial oath gods to protect Duppi-Tešub because of the friendly relationship of their grandfathers.²⁴³

§ 1. (1) [UM-MA ^d]UD^{ŠI} ¹Mur-š[i-li LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR₃ ^{URU}Ḫa-at-ti UR-SAG NA-RA-AM ^dU] (2) [DUMU ¹Šu₂-up]-pi-lu-li-u[-ma . . . :
 § 2 (3) ¹A-zi-ra-aš₂ tu-el šA₂ [¹Dup-pi-dTešuppi A-BI A-BI-KA e-eš-ta
 ... (6) [nu ¹A-zi-ra-aš₂ A-BU-IA] (7) pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš₂-ta-at A-BU-IA []
 A-BU-IA ¹A-zi-ra-an QA-DU KUR₂-ŠU₂ pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš₂-ta-at ...
 § 1. (B I 1–2) The word of my majesty, Muršili, great king, king of Ḫatti, beloved of the storm-god, son of Šuppiluliuma ...
 § 2 (B I 3–12) Aziru, your [grandfather] became the subject of my father. ... Aziru protected only my father, and my father protected Aziru, together with his land.

The king had a contractual relationship with the gods and the cult, which may help to clarify the contractual nature of the treaties imposed on submissive nations.²⁴⁴ In the mythical kingdom, the storm-god owned the land and its conquests, yet the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḫērîm* participated, like the nobility of the land, and received their shares. The king served the storm-god and conquered many lands to please the god. Thus myth and reality coincide in the treaties and in the legal prologues meant to justify the actions in real life to

²⁴¹ Hoffner, "Histories and Historians," 316.

²⁴² Altman, *Historical Prologue*, 186.

²⁴³ Ibid., 98.

²⁴⁴ Güterbock, "Hittite Religion," 83–109.

the mythical divine court of divine judges. The anointing of a king comes by divine mandate, which the king himself controls. As representative of the people and the god, the king fulfilled both a mythical role as subject of the god and the political role as ruler of the kingdom.²⁴⁵ Life, both mythical and real, began and ended with the Hittite king.

The focus on the centrality of the great king contrasted with the lack of focus in the inclusive religion with its multiplicity of gods. The inclusive religion had political consequences for the royal religion. In making the subjugation treaties with the cities, Hattuša forced the kings of the cities to swear by the gods of their own lands as well as by the imperial gods. This procedure, however, had the reverse effect of reinforcing the importance and stature of the local gods and thus undermined the military accomplishments of the great kings and the long-term success of the Hittite gods. In spite of their conquests and treaties then, the army of Hattuša did not introduce a new universal god to whom lands would owe allegiance and loyalty. Nor did the army of Hattuša attempt to reshape the local defeated nations into provinces in the likeness of the empire. The army of Hattuša destroyed a city that did not comply, deported the population to the heartland of Hattuša, and replaced the population with loyal people from Hattuša and governors from the extended royal family. Otherwise, local kings and countries that submitted to the king of Hattuša kept their thrones, kingdoms, and gods intact, as long as they met their obligations in payments of tribute.

4.3. Imperial Warfare of Hattuša

The imperial war machine served the gods and the great king. The historiographical “Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar” recorded the conquests and the way in which Anitta devoted the cities to the storm-god; it reads as follows:²⁴⁶

(1) ^mA-ni-it-ta DUMU ^mPi₂-it-ḫa-a-na LUGAL ^{URU}Ku-uš-ša-ra QI₂-BI₂-MA (2) ^{ne}pi₂-iš-aš-ta ^dIŠKUR-un-ni a-aš-šu-uš e-eš-ta ... (5) [LU]GAL ^{URU}Ku-uš-ša-ra URU-az kat-ta [pa-]an-ga-ri-it u₂[] (6) [nu ^{URU}Ne-e-ša-an iš-pa-an-di na-ak-ki-it da[-a-aš] ... (10) [nu ^mPi₂-i]t-ḫa-a-na-aš at-ta-aš-ma-aš a-apa-an ša-ni-ia u₂-it-ti (11) [ḫ]u-ul-la-an-za-an ḫu-ul-la-nu-un ^dUTU-az ut-ne-e (12) [ku-it k]u-it-pat₂ a-ra-iš nu-uš ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš-p[at₂ ḫ]u-u[l-la-nu-u]n ... (20) [n]e-pi₂-ša-aš ^dIŠKUR-ni ḫa-ap-pa-re-e-nu-un (21) ^dIŠKUR-un-ni-ia a-ap-pa ḫa-[ku-e-en] ... (49) ku-iš am-me-el a-ap-pa-an LUGAL-uš ki-i-ša-r[i] (50) nu ^{URU}Ḫa-at-tu-šu-an a-ap-pa a-ša-a-š[i]

²⁴⁵ Yakubovich, “Were Hittite Kings Divinely Anointed?” 121.

²⁴⁶ Neu, *Der Anitta-Text*, 10–13.

(51) *na-an ne-pi₂-ša-aš* ^dIŠKUR-aš *Ha-az-zi-e-e[t-tu]* ... (55) *nu*
^{URU}*Ne-e-ši* ^{URU}^{DIDL}*u₂-e-te-nu-un* ^{URU}*ia-an a-a[p-pa]* (56) *ne-pi₂-*
ša-aš ^dIŠKUR-na-aš *E₂-ir* *U₃ E₂* ^dŠi-u₂[-na-šum-mi-in AB-NI]. ... (58)
 KASKAL-za *ku-it a-aš-šu* *u₂-taḥ-h[u-un a-pe₂-e-da-an-da ḥa-liš-ši-*
ia-nu-un]

(1) Anitta, son of Piṭhana, king of Kuššara, speak! (2) He [Piṭhana] was beloved by the storm-god of heaven ... (5) The king of Kuššar came down from the city of Kuššar and conquered Neša in the night with great violence. ... (10) After my father, Piṭhana, I suppressed (11) a revolt. Any land that (12) rose up, I struck them all with the help of the sun-god. ... (20) I devoted the cities to the storm-god of Neša. (21) We allotted them to the storm-god of Neša as a devoted thing (*ḥappar*) ... (49) Whoever after me becomes king (50) and resettles Ḥattuša, (51) let the storm-god of the sky strike him. ... (55) I fortified the city of Neša. After that fortification (56), I built a temple for the storm-god of heaven and a temple for our goddess Šiu. ... (58) Whatever goods I brought back from my campaigns, I endowed there.²⁴⁷

The term *ḥappar* indicates a “permanent barring of human habitation from the site” or “annihilation”; a related term *ḥappariya* refers to something “sold.”²⁴⁸ The land of Ḥattu had started out as a collection of small, stable kingdoms in the Old Assyrian period, but internal rivalry between the successful cities of Kaneš and Ḥattuša led to turbulence among the kingdoms. Piṭhana and his son Anitta, the first great kings of Kuššara (mid-nineteenth cent. B.C.E.), set out to dominate central Anatolia and thereby destroyed the earlier business enterprises of the Old Assyrians.²⁴⁹

The existence of the perhaps mythical Labarna as the first great hero king of the Hittites remains debated, but the Annals of Ḥattušili I leave no doubt about the warfare of the Great King with the title Tabarna.²⁵⁰ Ḥattušili I (1650–1620 B.C.E.) marched to the Purattu (Euphrates) River and destroyed the towns in his path, as he reports:

(A, Obv. 1) The great king Tabarna exercised kingship in Ḥatti ... (3:17) I destroyed Ullumma. ... (18) I expropriated it.²⁵¹ ... (21) I went to Sallahsuwa, Sallahsuwa itself, (22) kindled a fire. They became my subjects. ... (4:24) I destroyed the city of Sanhwitta, and the surrounding countryside came under the protection of the sun-

²⁴⁷ Hoffner, “Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar,” 182–83; Neu, *Der Annita-Text*, 10–13.

²⁴⁸ Hoffner, “Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar,” 182–83.

²⁴⁹ Macqueen, “History of Anatolia,” 1088; Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 36–40.

²⁵⁰ Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 62.

²⁵¹ Houwink ten Cate, “History of Warfare,” 48.

god. (Rev. 1–3) I, the great king Tabarna, went to Zippasna ... and destroyed Zippasna. [Its gods I brought up to the sun-goddess of Arinna.]²⁵²

Ḫattušili I thus made war and waged campaigns of destruction in the service of the sun-goddess of Arinna. He freed slaves for deportation to Ḫattuša for work in the fields and the armed forces of Ḫattuša. He plundered the raw materials and human resources of the towns that he destroyed. He attacked Aleppo, Emar, Ebla, Zalpa, and Yamhad. He destroyed a city that did not submit to his protection but had mercy on submissive kings. Ḫattušili I's policy consisted of attack, destroy, and withdraw in the pursuit of raw materials and expansion of his area of plunder.

Ünal brings together from multiple sources the vocabulary of warfare carried out by Anitta and Šuppiluliuma I among others, as follows: “decapitations, putting a king in a yoke, seizure of messengers, murder and consumption of a woman, archery, siege, starvation, causing thirst, crushing of a hostile city, exploitation of plague and water shortage, battering-rams, trench-pits.”²⁵³

Muršili I followed Ḫattušili I's lead in attacking and plundering through the Hurrians on the way to Babylon (1595 B.C.E.). His conquest and plunder of Babylon coincided with the appearance of the Old Hittite Laws in Ḫattuša.²⁵⁴

Tudḫaliya I/II (1400–1370 B.C.E.) continued this policy of creating empire by conquest and founded the New Kingdom.²⁵⁵ He assassinated his predecessor Muwatalli I and established the groundwork of the Hittite empire by conquering western Anatolia.²⁵⁶ In the following passage from Tudḫaliya's *Annals*, he highlights his conquests:

(Vs. 1) UMMA *Taba*]r^{na} ¹Tudḫaliya LUGAL.GAL ... (22) *ūq₂-qa*] ¹Tuthalijas *ispan*[*d*]az *tuzzi*(n)-man SUD-nun / *huittij*[a- (23) *nu-za* šA ERIN₂^{MES} LU₂KUR₂ *tuzzin an*[*d*]a *hulalijanun* (24) *n-an-*]mu DINGIR^{MES} *parā pīēr* ^dU[TU ^URU]TUL₂-na *nepisas* ^dU-as / ^dIM-as (25) (^dKAL ^{URU})KU₃.BABBAR-ti ^dZA.BA₄.BA₄ ^dIŠTAR ^dXXX ^dLe/ilwanis (26) *n-ast*]a šA ERIN₃^{MES} LU₂KUR₂ *tuzzi*[*n kue*](nun) *namma-sta* KUR-eas-(s)mas (27) *and*]a *pāun kuēz-za-sta kuez* K[UR-eaz *t*]uzzis (28) *lahh*]a *u₂wanza ēsta* (29) *nu -mu* DINGIR^{MES} *piran hūiēr nu kī kue* KUR.KUR^{HLA} *l^amnijanun* (30) *kūr*]ur *kuiēs ēppⁱr n-at-mu* DINGIR^{MES} *parā pīēr* (31) *nu k]ē* KUR.KUR-TIM *hūman arnunun* NAM.RA^{MES}

²⁵² Melchert, “Acts of Ḫattušili I,” 14. Houwink ten Cate, “History of Warfare,” 47–52.

²⁵³ Ünal, “Untersuchung zur Terminologie,” 167.

²⁵⁴ Houwink ten Cate, “Hittite History,” 3:221.

²⁵⁵ Kuhrt, “Hittites,” 250; Hoffner, “Hittites,” 127.

²⁵⁶ Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 131.

GUD UDU K[UR-]eas āssu (32) arh]a^{URU} Hattusi u₂watenun (33) mā]n KUR^{URU} Āssuwa ħarninkun nu EGIR-pa^{URU} KU₃.BABBAR-si arha (34) u₂wa]nun alsandan-na I 10,000 ERIN₂^{MEŠ} U₃ 6 ME A.K.RA^{GIŠ} GIGIR^{dMEŠ} (35) LU₂^{MEŠ} i]smerijas BELU₂^{HI.A}-us^{URU} KU₃.BABBAR-si u₂watenun (36) n-us^{URU} KU₃.BABBAR-si asashun (Vs. 1) The word of the Tabarna, Tudhaliya, great king. ... (22) I Tuthaliya brought up my camp at night (23) and surrounded the camp of the army of the enemy. (24) The god delivered it to me: the sun-goddess of Arinna, the storm-god of Heaven, (25) the Protection-god of Hatti, Zababa, Ishtar, Sin, and Lelwani gods. (26) I struck the camp of the army of the enemy. ... (29) The gods went before me, and these countries, that I have named, (30) which were enemies, gave their gods to me. (31) I conquered all these lands and brought out the deportees, oxen, sheep, and wealth of the land to Hattuša. (33) As soon as I had destroyed Assuwa, I came back to Hattuša (34) and brought 10,000 captured soldiers, 600 chariot-fighters, (35) war-chariots, and the masters of the chariot-captains, (36) and settled them in Hattuša.²⁵⁷

Tudhaliya I/II thus resettled thousands of soldiers to Hattuša in order to weaken the subject cities but made no attempt to stabilize his control of the empire by political means.²⁵⁸

Ünal studied three hundred war reports and discovered mundane documentation of battles and weapons with few traceable references to actual places. Of 115 cases of destruction, he could identify only Alalah (1649 B.C.E.) and Babylon (1595 B.C.E.). The following war report typifies the obscure reports that always end with victory for the Hittite king. Ünal's study focused on the vocabulary of war (burn, consecrate, declare sacrosanct):

(1) I moved up at night to Zippašna and answered them with slaughter. I have heaped dust/ash upon them. (2) The Kaskaean began hostilities ... As I Tuthaliya arrived at Hattuša, I scattered the enemy troops. I followed them and penetrated into the Kaskaean land for the battle. ... Timmuḫala, Tiyaššilta, and Karaššuwa I burned. Because I hated Timmuḫala, and it further is an unimportant countryside, I consecrated it to the weather-god, my lord, and declared it sacrosanct. I established its boundaries. The people will never again live there.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁷ Ibid., 135 (*Annals*, obv. 22–36); Carruba, “Beiträge zur mittelhethitischen Geschichte,” 137–74; KUB xxiii, 27.

²⁵⁸ Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 135.

²⁵⁹ Ünal, “Studien,” 75; KUB XIX 37 Vs. II 1ff. = AM s.166ff.

Beyond the name Tudḫaliya, this account has no anchor in the history. These passages attest to the Hittite practice of consecrating a city to the gods by complete destruction. Hittite uses the “destroying” verb *ḫark-* “to be destroyed,” the causative *ḫarnink-* “to destroy,” and the intensive causative *arja ḫarnink-* “to destroy completely.”²⁶⁰ They portrayed such deeds as heroic deeds of the king. Refractory cities learned the meaning of the Hittite verbs *lukk-* (to set on fire) and *war-* (to burn).²⁶¹

Conquest ideology, according to Ünal, played an important role in Ḫattuša’s quest for their “ancestral homeland.” They waged war for the purpose of increasing their wealth and justified it as a means of providing for the temples and the palaces. They dedicated their plunder and slaves to the temple of the storm-god. Warfare constituted a part of the daily life of the Hittites, who recorded at least three hundred terms to account for war activities.²⁶² Although 85 percent of that war terminology comes from Hittite origin, many key terms, such as the Sumerogram ERIN₂.MEŠ army, come from Akkadian; according to Houwink ten Cate, the Hittites borrowed their war vocabulary from Akkadian cuneiform.²⁶³ According to Ünal, they learned not from the Old Assyrian merchants of Kaneš but from Syrian scribes brought to Ḫattuša as chattel by Ḫattušili I.²⁶⁴ The Hittite army waged war in the summer, but sieges could take years to accomplish. The warriors of Ḫattuša portrayed war as a lawsuit in a divine court in which conquest constituted the moral justification and positive verdict of the gods.²⁶⁵

Šuppiluliuma I (1350–1322 B.C.E.) murdered his brother and launched a campaign of conquest into Syria. He destroyed the state of Mitanni and, in a rage over the murder of his son in Egypt, attacked and destroyed many Egyptian-held cities of Syria. The prisoners of that campaign, however, brought a disastrous plague to Ḫattuša.²⁶⁶ The “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma” I in Muršili II’s Annals tell of the conquest of Mitanni, Aleppo, and Carchemish.²⁶⁷ The Annals describe the battles and the relocations of population as Muršili II writes, “my father, Šuppiluliuma, burned the Egyptian towns.” The king achieved many conquests in service of the sun-goddess, the storm-god, and Ištar. Šuppiluliuma I pleased the gods with many victorious battles, much plunder, and many prisoners: “The gods helped him so that he defeated the enemy, and the enemy died.”²⁶⁸ The Hittites, according to Ünal, consecrated the war-booty to the gods in appreciation of the gods’ help:

²⁶⁰ Ünal, “Studien,” 76.

²⁶¹ Idem, “Terminologie der hethitischen Kriegsführung,” 169.

²⁶² Ünal, “Studien,” 71.

²⁶³ Houwink ten Cate, “History of Warfare, 57.

²⁶⁴ Ünal, “Studien,” 72.

²⁶⁵ Houwink ten Cate, “History of Warfare, 72.

²⁶⁶ Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 183.

²⁶⁷ Hoffner, “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma,” 1:185–92.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 1:188.

“They consecrated the captured goods to the gods according to their practical intentions. ... The gods ran before me and helped me [DINGIR^{mes} *piran huwair*].”²⁶⁹ Muršili II’s composition, “The Manly Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I,” highlight his father’s career, as in the following passage:

[UM-MA^dUTU-ŠI^mMu-ur-ši-li LUGAL GAL] (2) [LUGAL KUR^{URU}Ha-at-ti U]R[.SAG] (3) [DUMU^mŠu-up-pi2-lu-li-u-ma LUGAL KUR^{URU}H]a-at-ti U[R.SAG] ... (frg. 15, 7') [nu A-NA] A-BU-IA DINGIR.MEŠ p[i₂-ra-an hu-u-e-er] (8') [dUTU^{URU}A-ri-in-a^{dU}URU]Ha-at-ti^{dU} [KI.KAL.BAD] (9') [dGAŠAN LIL₂-ia nu-kan₂ u-ni pa]-an-ku-un ŠU-TI [ku-en-ta] (10') nu EREM.MEŠ^{LU₂K}[UR₂ pa-an-ga-ri-i]t BA.BAD ... (frg. 28, A i 18) I-NA ŠA₃ KI.KAL.BAD.ĤI.A-ma-kan₂ BAD-aš ku-it nu ma-aḥ-ḥa-an^{URU}Qa-aš-qa-aš (19) a-uš-ta nu-kan an-tu-uḥ-ša-a-tar ku-it I-NA URU.AŠ.AŠ.ĤI.A-ŠU-NU (20) EGIR-pa pa-a-an e-eš-ta nu-uš-ma-ša-at-kan₂ an-da e-ep-pir ... (A iii 26) nu ku-it-ma-an^m.GIŠPA.LU₂-iŠ IŠ-TU KUR^{URU}Mi-iz-ri EGIR-pa u₂-it (27) EGIR-az-ma-za A-BU-IA^{URU}Kar-ga-mi-iš-ša-an URU-an tar-aḥ-ta ... (A iii 40) IŠ-TU NAM].RA.MEŠ KU₃.BABAR] KU₃.GI U₂-NU-UT UD.KA.BAR-ia (41) ša-ra-a da[-a-aš na-a]^{URU}Ha-at-tu-ši u₂-da-aš ... (frg. 31, 6') [mZa-an-na-an-za-a]n ku-en-nir nu me-mi-an u₂-t3-er^mZa-an-na-an-za[-aš-wa BA.BAD] ... (frg. 34, 2') [nu A-NA A-BU-IA DINGIR.MEŠ pi₂-ra-an hu-u-i-e-er]^{dUTU}URU A-r[i-in-na^{dU}URU]KU₃.BABAR-ti (3')^{dU} KI.KAL.BAD^{dIŠTAR} LIL₂-ia nu-za^L]U₂KUR₂ tar-aḥ-ta²⁷⁰

Fragment 1. (1) Thus speaks my sun, Muršili, the great king, king of Ḫatti, the hero son of Šuppiluliuma, king of Ḫatti ... (Frg. 15, 7') And the gods helped my father. The sun-goddess of Arinna, the storm-god of Ḫatti, the storm-god of the Army, and the Lady of the Battlefield, (so that) he slew the aforementioned whole tribe, and the enemy troops died in multitude. ... (frg. 28, 18) But when the Gasgaeans saw that there was a plague in the army, they seized the population who had again gone into their towns. ... (26) (In the meantime) until Ḫattuša-ziti came back from Egypt, my father finally conquered the city of Carchemish. ... (A iii 40) But from the lower town he removed the inhabitants, silver, gold, and bronze utensils and carried them to Ḫattuša. ... (frg. 31, 6') The people of Egypt killed Zannanza and brought word: 'Zannanza died! (frg. 34, 2') And the gods helped my father: The sun-goddess of Arinna, the storm-god of Ḫatti, the storm-god of the Army, and Ištar of the Battlefield, so he defeated the enemy, ... he burned down the towns of [Egypt].

²⁶⁹ Ünal, “Terminologie der hethitischen Kriegsführung,” 167.

²⁷⁰ Güterbock, “Deeds of Suppiluliuma,” 41–68, 75–98, 107–30.

Hittite imperial policy entailed conquering countries, annexing them to their empire, and granting the land to loyal subjects under conditions of political loyalty. They crushed rebellious cities with fire, confiscated the land and property, and deported the people to Ḫatti Land as a source of income for an economy depleted by constant warfare. A conquered country, including its people, became the legal property of the conquerors, who then put it under the control of a Hittite military protector. Such a state then had a protectorate status in which the governor served the political goals of the central Hittite administration under Šuppiluliuma I as in Prologue of the treaty of Niqmaddu II in which Šuppiluliuma I subjugated Ugarit: “This land shall be yours. Protect it!” (*pa-aj-ši*).²⁷¹

Ḫattuša’s principles of warfare, however, both created the empire and then created instability throughout it. Muršili II (1321–1295 B.C.E.) accelerated that policy of warfare and captured whole populations to transfer them to Ḫattuša. He accepted surrenders and wrote out subjugation treaties for submissive kings but crushed rebellious states. In the view of this study, Muršili II’s conquests accomplished little, however, because he made no recorded effort to stabilize the empire with political measures. Like Tudḫaliya I he resettled thousands of people on a “scale larger than that of the Neo-Assyrians” in order to restock the Hittite population, which he had reduced by constant warfare. Muršili II’s policy created a mixed population from the antipodes of Anatolia and Syria but also created the incurable problem of the fugitives. Forced into slave labor on the estates of Ḫattuša or into the army, the fugitives often rebelled or ran away, and the Ḫattuša treaties contain clauses about returning such fugitives to their owners.²⁷²

Muršili II’s Ten-Year Annals deal with the trust of the gods and the principle of loyalty versus treason.²⁷³ In the case of Muršili II and his battles, the sun-goddess of Arinna heard his words and vanquished his enemies, as the following passage illustrates:

(1) [UM-MA ^dUTU]^{šl} ¹Mur-ši-li LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR Ḫa-at-ti
UR.SAG ... (21) nu A-NA ŠA ^dUTU ^{URU}A-ri-in-na-pit₂ GAŠAN-IA
SAG.UŠ-aš A-NA EZEN.HI.A EGIR-an ti-ia-nu-un (22) na-aš-za i-ia-
nu-un ... (27) nu-mu ^dUTU ^{URU}A-ri-in-na me-mi-an iš-ta-ma-aš-ta
na-aš-mu kat-ta-an ti-ia-at (28) nu-zu-kan₂ A-NA ^{GIŠ}GU.ZA A-BI-IA
ku-ua-pi₂ e-eš-ḫa-at nu-za ki-e a-ra-aḫ-ze₂-na-aš (29)
KUR.KUR.MEŠ ^{LU2}KUR₂ I-NA MU 10.KAM tar-aḫ-ḫu-un na-at-kan₂ ku-
e-nu-un (30) ŠA KUR ^{URU}Tur₂-mi-it-ta-mu ^{URU}Ka₃-aš-ka₂-aš ku-u-ru-
ri-ia-aḫ-ta ... (32) nu-uš-ši ^dUTU^{šl} pa-a-un nu ŠA ^{URU}Ka₃-aš-ka₃ ku-i-
e-eš SAG.DU.MEŠ KUR.KUR.MEŠ ^{URU}Ḫa-li-la-aš (33) ^{URU}Du-ud-du-

²⁷¹ Altman, “Rethinking the Hittite System,” 754; RS 17.340; CTH 46.

²⁷² Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 218.

²⁷³ Beal, “Ten Year Annals,” 2:83.

*uška3-aš-ša e-šir na-aš gul-un na-aš IŠ-TU NAM.RA GUD.ḪI.A
UDU.ḪI.A (34) [š]a-ra-a da-aḫ-ḫu-un na-aš^{URU} KUBABBAR-ši ar-ḫa
u₂-da-aḫ-ḫu-un (35) [^{URU}Ḫa]-li-la-an-ma^{URU} Du-ud-du-uš-ka₃-an-na
ar-ḫa ua-ar-nu-nu-un ... (38) nu-mu^{dUTU} ^{URU}A-ri-in-na (39)
[GAŠAN-IA]^{dU} NIR.GAL₂ EN-IA^d Me-iz-zu-ul-la-aš DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-u-
ma-an-te-eš pi₂-ra-an ju-i-e-ir.*

1. [The Word of the Sun], Muršiliš, the great king of Ḫatti-Land, the hero, ... (21) I performed the regular festivals of the sun-goddess of Arinna, my lady. ... (27) The sun-goddess of Arinna heard my words and stood by me. (28) Thus I vanquished, as soon as I took the throne of my father, these enemy (29) foreign lands in ten years and destroyed them. (30) The Kaška people of Turmitta came for battle against me. ... (32) Then I, the Sun, moved out against them. I attacked the capital cities of the Kaška land: Ḫalila (33) and Dudduška. I looted their troops, cattle, and sheep (34) and brought them away to Ḫattuša. (35) I burned down Ḫalila and Dudduška. (38) The sun-goddess of Arinna, the proud weather-god, my lord, Mezzullaš, and all the gods stood by me.²⁷⁴

This element of trust and loyalty dovetails with the principle of warfare according to which the gods assure victory by running before the army: “The sun-goddess of Arinna, my lady, the victorious storm-god, my lord, Mezzulla and all the gods ran before me.” The gods, like the empire itself, intervened in war and in the affairs of state depending on evidence of the past loyalty or treason of the king. The Hittite concept of divine causality thus included a strong human element of loyalty or disloyalty. Muršiliš’s victory and loyalty in turn constituted his present moral uprightness before the storm-god of Heaven, who then claimed the war-booty as divine legal property by just conquest.²⁷⁵

The Hittites legitimized and justified this violent world of conquest by means of the annals and war reports. In order to deal with submissive rulers, who surrendered without a battle, they developed and implemented their form of international treaty that would make their case for conquest of a foreign land before a divine court with international jurisdiction. Thus arose the treaty document as an imperial tool that characterized their international relations within the empire and their network of loyal subjects.²⁷⁶ Their loyal subjects thus consisted of submissive kings who, faced with obliteration, swore the oath of voluntary subjugation (*ardu*) and accepted the Hittite terms of legitimate rule by legal conquest.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 2:84; Götze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*, 15–23.

²⁷⁵ Houwink ten Cate, “History of Warfare,” 62.

²⁷⁶ Klengel, *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*, 358.

²⁷⁷ Altman, “Rethinking the Hittite System,” 752.

4.4. *Subjugation Treaties of Hattuša*

The pattern of founding colonies to control foreign territories and goods began in Uruk, which established settlements in Syria and Anatolia.²⁷⁸ The pattern became embedded in the local Syrian cultures along with the spread of Mesopotamian languages and cultures. In the twentieth to eighteenth centuries B.C.E., the Assyrians arranged treaties with the Anatolian rulers from the central *kārum* of Kanesh. By means of donkey caravans, they traded tin and wool textiles from Mesopotamia for gold and silver in Anatolia. In this system, the Assyrian merchants profited even after paying taxes to the local rulers and chieftains. This system of free trade broke down in the eighteenth century B.C.E. with the formation of the centralized and militarized states in Babylonia, Anatolia, and Syria.

The first example of an Anatolian treaty comes from Tell Leilan and represents the Old Assyrian *kārum* trading network centered at Kaniš (Kültepe) (ca. 1750 B.C.E.).²⁷⁹ It consists of an international, but unilateral, agreement of the local ruler Till-Abnû and the city of Aššur to give protection to the Assyrian traders. Till-Abnû swears to the gods and to the Assyrian businessmen to abide by its terms, which consist of rules concerning merchandise, ransoms of people, property of traders, just dealings, lost property, physical protection, and a promise to adjure others to abide by the treaty. Although the foreign Assyrian traders had a subordinate and vulnerable position, the local rulers thus guaranteed their demands for safety, as follows:

Col. I (1) [AN *t*]a-ma (2) ^dEN.LIL₂ ta-ma (3) [^dLUGAL]-ma-ti₂-in ta-ma (4) [^dD]a-gan₂ ta-ma (5) [^dI]M ša IB ta-ma (6) [^dEN.ZU ša IB ta-ma (7) [^dUTU ša IB ta-ma (8) [^dUTU A-šu-ri-a ta-ma (9) [^dN]i-ri-ig-la₂ LUGAL (10) [ša H]u-ub-ši₂-il₅ ta-ma (11) [^deš₄]-tar₂ A-šu-ri-tam₂ ta-ma (12) [^dB]e-[l]a-at A-pi₂-im ta-ma (13) [^dBe-[l]a-at Ni-nu-wa t[a]-ma (145) [^dNi-k[a₃-r]a-ak [ta]-ma (15) [^dI]š-h[a]-ra ta-ma (16) DINGIR SA.TU [u₃] m[a]-tim u₃ na-[ra]-tim ta-[m]a (17) DINGIR KI U₃ [l]B-e ta-[ma] (18) [DIN]GIR Sa₃-ga-[a]r u₃ [Z]a-ra (19) ta-ma (20) [DINGIR MAR].TU (21) u₃ Šu-ba-ri-im ta-[ma] (22) DINGIR.ME-EŠ a-ni-u₂-tim / m[a-la] (23) [u]š-buni ta-[ma] (24) [Ti₂-i]a₂-ab₂-nu DUMU Da-ri-[e-pu-uḥ] (25) [LUG]AL A-pe₂-e-em [ki] (26) [a-n]a a-lim^{KI} [^dA-šur] (27) [DUMU] ^dA-šur [e-li]-t[im][u₃ i-na] [a]-[l]i-k[a₃] ... [break]
End of col. II. [i-na a-]li-k[a] []-ka lu z[a-ku-u₃] [u₃] [e]-nu-ut / ši₂-di₂-[ti₂-šu]

²⁷⁸ Yoffee, "Economy of Ancient Western Asia," 1387–99.

²⁷⁹ Eidem, "Old Assyrian Treaty," 185–208.

Col. III. [a-t]a la₃ ta-la₃-qe₂-ma (2) [t]u₃-šar / ki-tam / li-ba-[am] (3) [gam₂]-ra-am / iš-ti₂-ni (4) a-lim^{kl} dA-šur u₃ ka₃-ri-i[m] (5) a-di / ba-al-ṭa₂-t[i₂]-ni (6) lu ta-ta₃-wi / iš-tu₃ (7) u₄-mi₃-im / a-nim ša pi₂-i (8) tup-pi₂-im / a-ni-e-em (9) ša a-na a-lim^{kl} dA-šur (10) DUMU dA-šur su-um-šu (11) u₃ ka₃-ri-im / ni-iš (12) [DINGIR] ta-az-ku-ru (13) lu ta-na-ša-ar (14) šu-ma / ni-iš DINGIR / a-ni-a-a[m] (15) ša a-lim^{kl} dA-šur DUMU [A]-šur (16) e-li-tim u₃ a-ri-tim (17) [u₃] ka₃-ri-im (18) [t]a-az-ku-ru-u₃ (19) [] bu-a-ar-ka₃ ... break.

Col. IV. (5) [] iš-[tu] (6) [iš-ti₂-š]u / i-na ki-na-tim (7) [] DUMU dA-šur₃ (8) [ki-ma] DUMU a-li-ka (9) [u₃-ma]-ti₂-ka₃ / la₂ ta-ša-gi₅-šu (10) [] u₃ šu-ma / lu ANŠE.HA₂ (11) [ša a]-li-ik GAN₃-lim (12) [lu DUM]U dA-šur₃ (13) [DUMU a-li-]ka u₃ ma-ti₂-ka₃ (14) [iṣ]-bu-tu₃ ... break (6') [] um-m[a] [a-ta] / ma (7') [a-na-ku ni-i]š DINGIR (8') [a-na a-lim][^{kl}] dA-šur₃ (9') [DUMU dA-š]ur₃ u₃ ka₃-ri-[im] (10') [za-ak-r]a-ku a-lik (11') [hu-lu-u]q / DUMU dA-šur₃ (12') [ep-š]a-am-ma a-na

Col. I. Swear by An! Swear by Enlil! Swear by Šarra-mātin! Swear by Dagan! (5) Swear by Adad of heaven! Swear by Sîn of heaven! Swear by Šamaš of heaven! Swear by Assyrian Šamaš! Swear by Nirigla, the king (10) of Ḫubšil! Swear by the Assyrian Ištar! Swear by Bēlat-Apim! Swear by the Lady of Nineveh! Swear by Ninkarak! (15) Swear by Išhara! Swear by the gods of mountain, and lowland and rivers! Swear by the gods of earth and sky! Swear by the gods of Saggār and Zārā! (20) Swear by the gods of Martu and Subrtu! Swear by these gods all that are present! Till-Abnû, son of Dari-Epuh (25) the king of Apum of the city of divine Aššur, a citizen of Aššur going up or going down, and the *kārum* which is in your city ... break ...

Col. II. [The text makes fragmentary references to “import duty on commodities, receipts, coppers, donkeys, loads, import tax, ransom, immunity”] in your town your country shall be [cleared], and his travel provisions.

Col. III. (1) You shall not take, but you shall release them. The truth in complete sincerity with us, the city of Aššur and the *kārum*, (5) as long as you live, you shall speak. From this day, the contents of this tablet, which to the city of Aššur (10) any Assyrian citizen, and the *kārum* you swore you shall observe. If this oath (15) concerning the city of Aššur, any citizen of Aššur, going up or going down, and the *kārum* you swore ... your prosperity ... break ...

Col. IV. (5) [] since with him truthfully [] a citizen of Aššur like a citizen of your city and your country you must not pressure (10) [] and if donkeys of a merchant passing through or a citizen of Aššur citizens of your city or your country [] seize ... (6') if you say as follows: I myself [] an oath to the city of Aššur, the citizens of

Aššur, and the *kārum* (10') I have sworn; you go and effect the disappearance of a citizen of Aššur and to [].

This Old Assyrian treaty between citizen merchants of Aššur (DUMU ^dA-šur) and the king of Apum (LUGAL A-pe₂-e-em ki) invokes the Mesopotamian gods An, Enlil, etc. It protects the rights of merchants and residents, and their persons, property, and borders. It guarantees compensation for damages, and specifies fair taxes, tolls, and prices; it resembles the pre-imperial treaties from the Levant. The two parties swore the treaty sworn under the Eye of Aššur (legal symbol) rather than in the presence of a god statue. Although the Old Assyrian business treaty presents unilateral demands from the Assyrian merchants, it presents a fitting contrast between the early cooperative bilateral concept of legality and the later concept of military, legal conquest in the subjugation treaties of Hattuša.

With Tudhaliya I/II, the imperial conqueror, began the period of the New Kingdom or empire and the expanded use of intimidation, protection, and subjugation treaties. The treaty with Sunassura of Kizzuwadna, the first in Hittite history, deals with matters of security: the return of fugitive subjects, the transportation and enslavement of conquered populations, subordination, justification, and protection, as follows:

(A i 3) *i-na bi-ri-šu₂-nu []* (4) *ri-ik-ša₂-am an-ni-e[-am] i-na bi-ri-šu₂-nu ir-ku-šu₂* (5) *pa-na-nu-un- a-na pa-n[i a]-bi a-bi-ja-māt ^{al}Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-ni* (6) *ša₂ mār ^{al}Ha-at-t[i i]p-pa-ši arga^{ar-ga}-nu-um māt ^{al}Ki-iz-zu-w[a-a]t-ni* (7) *a-na māt ^{al}Ha-a[t-t]i ip-tu-ur a-n[a m]āt Har-ri iš-ḫu-ur ...* (30) *i-na-an-na māt ^{al}Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-ni ša₂ ^{al}Ha-at-ti alpē^{zun}* (31) *u₃ bīt alpē^{zun}-šu-nu u₂-wa-ad-du-nim it-ti Har-ri* (32) *ip-du-ru a-na ^dŠamšī^{si} iš-ḫu-ru ...* (34) *māt ^{al}Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-ni ma-kal ta-an-ni[i]-iš i-na bi-iṭ-ri-iš* (35) *ir-ti-i-šu₂ ...* (45) *ma-ti-me-e ^dŠamšī^{si} i-ša₂-az-zi-šu₂ a-na ma-aḫ-ri-ya al-kam-mi* (46) *šum-ma a-na a-la-ki u₂-ul ḫa-še-iḫ ma-an na-am mār-šu₂ ^dŠamšī^{si}* (47) *i-qab-bi šu₂-u₂-tu₂ a-na ma-ḫar ^dŠamšī^{si} il-la-ak* (48) *u₃ a-na ^dŠamšī^{si} ar-ga-ma-an-na lu-u₂ la i-na-an-ti-in ...* (49) *^dŠamšī^{si} šarru rabū ^mŠu₂-na-aš₂-šu₂-ra u₂-ul i-ma-aḫ-ar-šu₂ ...* (55) *^mŠu₂-na-aš₂-šu₂-ra šarri rabī u₂-ul i-ma-aḫ-ar-šu₂ u₂-ul i-na-ak-ki-ir-šu₂ ... a-i-u₂-me-e* (58) *^dŠamšī^{si} apil-šu₂ a-na šar-ru-tim ša₂ a-na ^mŠu₂-na-aš₂-šu₂-ra* (59) *i-ka-ab-bi ^mŠu₂-na-aš₂-šu₂-ra šu₂-u₂-tam a-na šar-ra-tim i-na-az-ar-šu₂ ...* (62) *[šum-ma amēlu a-ia-b i-na mā]t ^{al}[Ha-a]t-ti-ma šu₂-u₂-tu₂ šum-ma* (63) *[alam^{lam} iz-za-ab-ba-at i-bi-iḫ-ḫi ki-me-e š]a₂ ^dŠamšī^{si} ^{lu₃}nakru-šu₂* (64) *[a-na ^mŠu₂-na-a₂-šu₂-ra qa-tam-ma ^{lu₃}nakru]-šu₂ ...* (A iv 19) *ša₂-ni-tam ^dŠamšī^{si} šum-ma i-na māti^{ki} ša₂-ni-i ...* (20) *i-na ta-ḫa-az-zi a-al- la-ak* (21) *^mŠu₂-na-aš₂-šu₂-ra*

100 zi-im-ti sisē^{zun} I li-im šabe^{meš} šēpe^{zun} (22) it-ta-na-an-din a-na ka-ra-a-ši it-ti^d Šamši^{ši} it-ta-na-al-la-ak²⁸⁰

§ 1 (A i 3). They swore an oath to one another and concluded this treaty with one another. [Legal justification:] § 2. Formerly Kizzuwatna came into the possession of Hatti, but afterwards the land of Kizzuwatna freed itself from Hatti and turned to Hurri ... § 7 (30) Now the people of the land of Kizzuwatna are Hittite cattle and have chosen (31) their stable. They freed themselves from the ruler of Hurri and returned to the Sun. ... § 8. (34) The land of Kizzuwatna rejoiced exceedingly over its liberation. ... § 10. (45–48) Whenever the Sun summons him, “Come before me!”—if he does not wish to come, one of his sons designated by the Sun must come before the Sun. But he does not have to pay tribute to the Sun. ... [Succession:] § 11 (49) The Sun, the great king, must not stir up revolt against Sunaššura nor be hostile to him. ... § 12 (55–59) Sunaššura, the great king, must not stir up revolt against the Sun nor be hostile to him. ... (58) Sunaššura must protect for kingship whichever son of His Majesty he designates to Sunaššura as his successor. ... [Defensive alliance:] (62) If the enemy is in Hatti, if he has seized or encircled a city, as he is His Majesty’s enemy, he must likewise be Sunaššura’s. ... § 57. [Military obligations:] (A iv 19) When I, My Majesty, go into battle against another land ... Sunaššura must provide 100 teams of chariots and 1,000 infantrymen and march in the army in the company of the Sun.

Tudḫaliya I/II, like his predecessors, however, left no lasting political apparatus in place to administer his incipient empire.²⁸¹ Nor did he leave a garrison in Kizzuwatna to enforce the treaty, and as with other Hittite treaties, the local rulers ignored it when the Hittite army left.

The protection and subjugation treaties of Šuppiluliuma I (1350–1322 B.C.E.) emphasized friendship, loyalty, and protection. Before the plague of vengeance killed him, Šuppiluliuma I conquered and devastated Mitanni and much of Syria and left four treaties behind in an attempt to sustain his dominance of the area.²⁸²

In the Treaty with Niqmaddu II of Ugarit, Šuppiluliuma I provided a historical justification for his domination of Ugarit and imposed Hittite military protection of Ugarit’s lucrative business enterprises: “You, Niqmaddu, do

²⁸⁰ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 17–26 (Treaty #2); Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien*, 88–111 (here called “Vertrag zwischen Muwatalli, König von Hatti und Sunaššura, König von Kizwatna”); Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 139.

²⁸¹ Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 131–38 (*Indictment* § 8).

²⁸² Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 161, 164, 165 (RS 17.132); Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 22–44.

not fear them, have confidence in yourself! ... Be the enemy of my enemy and the friend of my friend ... Be faithful to the alliance of friendship.” The treaty guaranteed Niqmaddu the protection of the Hittite king.²⁸³

In his treaty with Hukkanaš and the people of Hayaša, Šuppiluliuma I stressed his concerns about the loyalty of his subject and the treatment of his daughter among a people who practiced incest, as follows:

(A iii 29–31) ŠEŠ-[ŠU] SAL + KU-ZU ^{SAL} a-a-an-ni-in-ni-ia-mi-in U₂-UL [da-a-i] (30) U₂.U.-at a-a-ra ku-iš-ma-at i-e-zi a-pi₂-ni-iš-[šu-u-u] a-an[-na] ut-tar (31) na-aš ^{URU} Ha-at-tu-ši U₂.UL hu-u-iš-šu-u-iz-zi a-ki-pa

Der [eigene] Bruder darf die eigene Schwester (und) die Kusine nicht nehmen, (30) das ist nicht recht. Wer aber so etwas tut, (31) der bleibt in Hattušaš nicht am Leben, (sondern) stirbt.²⁸⁴

In the following Treaty with Aziru of Amurru, Šuppiluliuma I expressed the need for Aziru’s continued loyalty, the return of fugitive slaves, and the payment of tribute in return for Hittite protection.²⁸⁵ The treaty does not emphasize punishment by death or exile although the language of friendship from one’s imperial conqueror presupposed those threats. The treaty with Aziru uses the classic vocabulary of the Hittite treaty: Aziru submitted, became brothers and friends with the king of Hatti by oath and pledge of mutual aid, offered service to king, and received protection from king. A “thousand gods” witnessed it, as follows:²⁸⁶

(22) š[umma i]t-[ti šar māt ^{al}Hatti ^{lu₃}nakru ša₂-nu-u₂ i-tab-bi u₃ māt ^{al}Hatti] i-ḫab-bat šum-ma (23) [it-ti šar māt ^a]Hatti šu₂-bal-ku-[tu₂ innippu^{us} ^mA-zi-ra i-ša₂-am-me-ma ... išt]u šabē^{meš}-šu₂ ^{iš}nark-abāt^{meš}[-šu₂] (24) [a-n]a ti-el-la-at šarri rab[ī ḫa-mut-ta il-lak ... (Rückseite) (12) [mi-i-nu-me-e a-wa-te^{meš} ša₂ ri-ik-si u₃ ša₂ ma-mi-ti] i-na libbi^{bi} ṭub-bi an-ni-ti (13) [šaṭ-rat^{at} šum-ma ^mA-zi-ra a-wa-te^{meš} an-na-ti ša₂] ri-ik-si u₃ ma-mi-ti (14) [la-a i-na-šar u₃ išt-tu ma-mi-ti i-te-te-iq u₃] ni-eš ilāni^{meš} an-nu-tim ^mA-zi-ra ... (16) lu-ḫal-li-ku-šu₂-nu (17) [u₃ šum-ma ^mA-zi-ra a-ma-te^{meš} an-na-ti ša₂ ri-ik-si] u₃ ša₂ ma-mi-ti ša₂ i-na lib[bi^{bi}] (18) [ṭub-bi an-ni-ti šaṭ-ratat i-na-šar-šu₂-nu u₃ ^mA-zi-ra ni]-eš ilāni^{meš} ... (20) [li-i]z-zu-ru-šu₂

²⁸³ Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites*, 165; Nougayrol, *Le palais royal d’Ugarit*, 48–52.

²⁸⁴ Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches*, 124–25. “The brother may not take his own sister or cousin. That is not right. Whoever may do such a thing, he does not remain in Hattuša alive but dies” [my translation of Friedrich].

²⁸⁵ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 32–37.

²⁸⁶ Singer, “Treaties,” 93–95; Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 32–37; Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien*, 133–38.

(22) W[enn g]eg[en den König des Landes Ḫatti ein anderer Feind sich erhebt und das Land Ḫatti] plündert, wenn (23) [gegen den König des Landes] Ḫatti eine Empöru[ng ausbricht, Azira davon hört und ... so soll er mi]t seine Krieger[n] (und) [seinen] Wage[n] (24) [zu]r Unterstützung des groß[en] Königs [eilends kommen.] [Rückseite] (12) [Alle Wörter des Vertrages und des Eides, die] auf dieser Tafel (13) [geschrieben stehen, wenn Azira diese Wörter des] Vertrages und des Eides (14) [nicht innehält und den Eid übertritt], bei diesen Göttern: den Azira ... (16) sie mögen sie vernichten. (17) [Wenn Azira aber diese Worte des Vertrages] und des Eides, die auf (18) [dieser Tafel geschrieben stehen, er sie innehält, so mögen den Azira, b]ei diesen Göttern ... (20). ihn [sch]ützen.²⁸⁷

These treaty words express the double-edged nature of the relationship in which the lesser party both submits to the protection, aid, and service of the imperial power but at the same time expects to receive the respect of a brother and a friend. The vocabulary suggests that Aziru submitted voluntarily and requested the protection of Šuppiluliuma I: “Azira, king of Amurru ... submitted himself to my majesty, king of Hatti ... I, my majesty, Great King, took up Azira and ranked him among his brothers.”²⁸⁸ Kings and princes of Amurru, because of this amicable relationship, receive Hittite daughters in marriage and sent their sons to receive an education in Ḫattuša.

Although Šuppiluliuma I destroyed Mitanni, one treaty from that kingdom survives, according to Beckman. In this treaty Šuppiluliuma I promised marriage of his daughters with Mitannian princes and swore by the Indic gods Mitra, Varuna, Indra, and Nasatyas of Mittanni. Before destroying Mittanni, Šuppiluliuma claimed: “I, Great King, king of Hatti, have given life to the land of Mittanni for the sake of my daughter.”²⁸⁹ Such rhetoric expresses the irony of the real threat behind the words of life and support.

Muršili II’s treaty with Duppi-Tešub of Amurru demands loyalty to the king of Ḫatti and expresses many of the same themes—oath, protection, submission, friendship—as that of Šuppiluliuma I with Aziru. as follows:²⁹⁰

²⁸⁷ “If another enemy rises up against the king of the land of Ḫatti and plunders the land of Ḫatti, if a rebellion breaks out against the king of the land of Ḫatti, and Azira hears about it ... then he should come immediately with his warriors and his chariots to the support of the great king. [Reverse] All the words of the treaty and of the oath that are written on this tablet, if Azira does not hold within to the words of the treaty and the oath, and he violates, by these gods, Azira ... may they destroy him. If Azira holds within to these words of the treaty and the oath, which are inscribed on this tablet, then may these gods support Azira” [my translation of Weidner].

²⁸⁸ Singer, “Treaties,” 93–95.

²⁸⁹ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 41–44.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 98.

- § 1 (1) [UM-MA^d]UD^{ŠI} ¹Mur-š[i-li LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR₃^{URU} *Ha-at-ti* UR-SAG NA-RA-AM dU] (2) [DUMU¹Šu₂-up]-pi-lu-li-u[-ma:
 § 2 (3) ¹A-zi-ra-aš₂ tu-el šA₂ [¹Dup-pi-^dTešuppi A-BI A-BI-KA e-eš-ta ... (6) [nu ¹A-zi-ra-aš₂ A-BU-IA] (7) pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš₂-ta-at A-BU-IA [] A-BU-IA ¹A-zi-ra-an QA-DU KUR₂-ŠU₂ pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš₂-ta-at.
 § 5 (19) [n]u tu-uk ma-aḥ-ḥa-an-ma^dUD^{ŠI} IŠ-TU A-UA-AT A-BI-KA EGIR-an (20) ša₂-aḥ-ḥu-un nu-ut-ta A-NA A-ŠAR A-BI-KA ti-it-ta[-nu]-nu-un (21) nu-ut-ta ka-a-aš₂-ma A-NA LUGAL KUR₂^{URU} *Ha-at-ti* KUR₂^{URU} *Ha-at-ti* (22) U₃ A-NA DUMU^{MEŠ}-IA DUMU-DUMU^{MEŠ}-IA še-ir li-in-ga-nu-nu-un (23) nu NI-ŠI DINGIR^{LIM} šA₂ LUGAL U₃¹ ŠU₂ LUGAL pa-aḥ-ši^dUD^{ŠI}-ma tu-uk (24) ¹Dup-pi₂-^dTešup^{up}-an pa-aḥ-ḥa-aš₂-ḥi
 § 10 (30) ma-a-an-ša-an DUMU^{MEŠ} ^{URU}*Ha-at-ti* ZAB^{MEŠ} ANŠU-KUR₂-RA^{MEŠ} A-NA ¹Dup-pi-^dTešup^{up} (31) se-ir ar-ḥa u₂-ua-da-an-zi na-at-kan₂ A-NA URU^{AS2} AŠ₂^{HLA} ku-it (32) ša₂-ra-a i-ia-ad-da-ri nu-uš-ma-aš₂ ¹Dup-pi-^dTešup^{up}-aš a-da-an-na (33) a-ku-ua-an-na pi₂-iš-ki-iz-zi.
 § 11 (39) nu-mu-kan₂ ma-a-an (40) a-pi-el ku-iš-ki šA₂ NAM-RA^{MEŠ} ḥu-u-ua-iz-zi na-aš₂ tu-uk (41) kat-ta-an u₂-iz-zi zi-ga-an U₂-UL e-ip-ti (42) na-an A-NA LUGAL KUR₂^{URU} *Ha-at-ti* EGIR-pa U₂[-UL] pi₂-eš-ti ... (45) nu-kan₂ NI-EŠ DINGIR^{LIM} šar-ra-at-ti.
 § 18 (1) ^dKu-li-it-ta^dZA-BA-BA^{URU} *Ha-at-ti* (2) ^dZA-BA-BA^{URU} El-la-ia^dZA-BA-BA^{URU} Ar-zi-ia (3) ^dI-ia-ar-ri-iš^dZa-am-pa-na-aš₂ ... (13) DINGIR^{MEŠ} LU₃^{MEŠ} DINGIR^{MEŠ} SAL^{MEŠ} šA₂^{URU} *Ha-at-ti* (14) [DINGIR^{MEŠ} LU₃^{MEŠ}] DINGIR^{MEŠ} SAL^{MEŠ} šA₂^{URU} A-mur-ri DINGIR^{MEŠ} ka-ru-u₂-i-li-e-eš (15) [ḥu-u-ma-an-du]-uš ... (19) A-NA AN-NI-I RI-IK-SI (20) [U₃] A-NA MA-ME-TUM^{LU3}ŠE-BU-TUM²⁹¹
 § 1 (B I 1–2) The word of my majesty, Muršili, great king, king of Ḫatti, beloved of the storm-god, son of Šuppiluliuma.
 § 2 (B I 3–12) [Historical] Aziru, your [grandfather] became the subject of my father. ... Aziru protected only my father, and my father protected Aziru, together with his land.
 § 5 (A I 19'–34') [Mutual Loyalty] And as I took care of you according to the request of your father, and installed you in place of your father, I have now made you swear an oath to the king of Ḫatti and the land of Ḫatti, and to my sons and grandsons. Observe the oath and the authority of the king. I, my majesty, will protect you.
 § 10 (A ii 30'–37') [Subordination] If Hittites bring you, Tuppi-Teshup, infantry and chariotry, because they will go up into your cities, Tuppi-Teshup must regularly provide them with food and drink.
 § 11 (A ii 38'–45') [Fugitives] If one of these civilian captives flees from me and comes to you, and you do not seize him and give him back to the king of Ḫatti, ... you will transgress the oath.

²⁹¹ Friedrich, “Die Verträge Muršiliš’ II,” 1–48.

§ 18 (1) [Gods: Hittite text: after gap] Kulitta, zababa of Ḫatti (2) zababa of Ellaja, zababa of Arziya, etc., ... (13) the masculine gods and the feminine gods of Ḫatti, (14) [the masculine gods] and the feminine gods of Amurru (15) all together ... (19) are to this treaty (20) and oath witnesses. [Akkadian text: The thousand gods ... the sun-god of heaven, the sun-goddess of Arinna, etc.]

The treaty includes a list of divine witnesses that included the “sun-god of Heaven, the sun-goddess of Arinna, ... and the gods of the oath.” It finishes with the “words of the treaty and the oath written on this tablet, let these oath gods protect Duppi-Tešub.”

The Treaty of Muṣili II (1321–1295 B.C.E.) with Niqmepa of Ugarit (1300 B.C.E.) deals with the problems of fugitives and manpower shortages, as the following passage indicates:

(1) *um-ma*^d *šamši*^m *Mu-ur-ši-li* [*šarri rabī*] *šar*₃ *māt*^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti* (2) *at-tu*₃-*ka* *ša*^m *Niq₂-me-pa* *a-[na]* *aḫḫi*^{MES}-*ka* [*at-ta-ra-aš*] *u*₃ *šarra* *a-na*^{GIS} *kussī* *a-bi-ka* (3) *ul-te-še-eb-ka* *ša* *a-b[i-ka]*] *ut-te-er-ra-ak-ku* *u*₃ *at-ta*^m *Niq₂-me-pa* (4) *qa-du māti-ka ardi*^{di3} ... (13) *u*₃ *it-ti sa-al-mi-ia lu-u*₂ *sa-al-ma-a-ta it-ti*^{LU₂} *nakri-ia lu-u*₂ *na-ak-ra-a-ta* ... (30) *u*₃ *šum-ma it-ti* *šar*₃ *māt*^{URU} *Ḫa-a[t-ti]*^{LU₂} *nakru* *ša-nu-u*₂ *i-te-eb*⁰ *bi* *u*₃ *māt*^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti i-ḫab-bat* (31) *u*₃ *šum-ma it-ti* *šar*₃ *māt*^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti* [*na-bal-ku-tu*₂ *iṅni-pu-uš*^m *Niq₂-me-pa* *i-ša-am-me-ma*] (32) *u*₃ *q[a-du šābi*^{MES}]-*šu*^{GIS} *narkabāti*^{MES}-*šu* [*a-na ti-il-la-at šarri ḫa-mut-ta il-la-ak* ... (35) *u*₃ *šum-ma ak-ka*₃-*a-ša* *a-na*^m *Niq₂-me-[pa a-ma-ta ma-am-ma is-sa*₂-*aḫ-ḫa-at-ka lu-u*₂ *arad-ka]* *lu-u*₂ *ma-am-ma* *u*₃ *a-na* *šar*₃ *mā[t*^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti ta-šap-par*₂-*ma a-na ti-il-lu-ti-ia al-kam-mi*₃] (37) *u*₃ *šarru a-na ti-il-lu-ti-[ka il-la-a-ka* ... (45) *u*₃ *a-i-u*₂-*ti-me-e* *šallāti*^{MES} *iš-tu mātā*^{MES} [*ti*^{MES} *an-na-a-ti* *šar*₃ *māt*^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti*] ... (55) *m*^m *Niq₂-me-pa li-iš-ba-as* [*su*₂-*nu* *u*₃ *a-na* *šar*₃ *māt*^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti li-te-er-šu-nu*] ... (58) [*mi-nu-um-me-e a*]-*ma-te*^{MES} [*i-na*] *pu-uz-ri* *ša* *šar*₃ *mā[t*^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti a-ma-ta an-ni-ta*] [*ša-a a-na*] *ia-nu-[um]-ma-a a-qab*₂-*ba*₂-*ak-ku* *u*₃ *šum*[-*ma*^m *Niq₂-me-pa a-ma-ta an-ni-ta*] [*la-a ta-na-aš-ša-a*] *r* *iš-tu ma-mi-ti te-te-ti-iq* ... (70) *šum-ma iš-tu māt*^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti*^{LU₂} *mu-nab-ṭu*₄ *in-n[a-am-bi-iṭ il-la-a-ka]* (71) *m*^m *Niq₂-me-pa li-iš-bat-su*₂-*ma a-na* *šar*₃ *māt*^{URU} *Ḫa-a[t-ti li-te-er-šu* *u*₃ *šum-ma*^m *Niq₂-me-pa*] *iš-tu ma-mi-ti [i-te-ti-iq]* ... (86) [*li-im ilāni*]^{MES} *li-ip-ḫu-ru* [*i-iš-te-mu-u*₂ *u*₃ *lu-uw* *še-bu-tu*₄] (87) [^dUTU AN^e ^dUTU^{URU} A-ri-in-na [^dISKUR AN^e ^dISKUR^{URU} *Ḫa-at-ti* ... (110) *būrū*^{MES} [*t*]^a *āmtu rabītu* *ša-mu-u* *u*₃ [*er-še-ti šārū*^{MES}] *u*₃ *ir-bi-tu*₂ (111) *a-na an-ni-i ri-ik-si*₂ *u*₃ [*ma-me-ti lu-u*₂ *še-bu-*]-*tu*₄²⁹²

²⁹² Kestemont, “Le traite entre Mursil II de Hatti et Niqmepa d’Ugarit,” 85–127.

(1) Ainsi (s'adresse) le soleil Muršili, [l'Empereur], le Roi de Pays de Hatti: (2) (Attendu qu')en ce qui te concerne, Niqmepa, [je t'ai concilié] avec tes pairs et (que) (3) j'ai cherché à provoquer ton installation, comme roi, sur le trône paternel et ai oeuvré à ce que te soit remis le Pays de ton père. (Attendu que) toi, Niqmepa, (4) ainsi que ta nation, (tu es) mon client. ... (13) Ensuite: sois en état de paix envers qui est en état de paix avec moi; sois en état de guerre envers qui est en état de guerre avec moi. ... (30) Et si [un ennemi étranger surgit] contre le Roi du Pays de Hat[ti et qu'il fasse campagne en Pays de Hatti,] (31) et si [un état de rebellion est provoqué] contre le Roi du Pays de Hatti, [si Niqmepa est sollicité] (32) eh bien, avec ses troupes, [il viendra rapidement en renfort au roi]. ... (35) Ensuite, si, contre toi, Niqme[pa, quelqu'un soulève une affaire—que ce soit un tien ressortissant] ou un individu quelconque—et qu [tu mandes] au Roi du Pays de Hatti: ["Viens-moi en renfort!"] (37) eh bien, le Roi [viendra à toi] en renfort. ... (45) Quant à tous les déditices provenant des pays [suivants que le Roi du Pays de Hatti a emportés ... (50) que Niqmepa les arrête [et qu'il les rende au roi du Pays de Hatti.] ... (58) [Quant à toute af]faire [en] secret, à propos de quoi le Roi du Pays [de Hatti] te déclarera [une telle affaire (59) come une affaire qui] n'est absolument pas [à révéler] eh bien, si, [Niqmepa, tu ne preserves pas cette affaire], tu sors du traité. ... (70) Si, du Pays de Hatti, un réfugié, en fuite, [fait route], (71) que Niqmepa l'arrête et [le rende] au Roi du Pays de Hatti; [Sinon, Niqmepa sort] du traité. ... (86) [Nous voulons ici que] le [milliers de dieux] s'assemblent, qu'[ils prêtent attention et qu'ils soient témoins des présents engagements]: (87) [le dieu-solaire céleste], le dieu solaire d'Arinna, [le dieu-orage céleste, le dieu-orage de Hatti ... (110) les sources, le océan, le ciel et [la terre, les vents], et les nuages.²⁹³

²⁹³ "Thus speaks the sun Muršili, the emperor, the king of the land of Hatti: Considering that which concerns you, Niqmepa, I have reconciled with your peers and have sought to provoke your installation as king on the paternal throne and have sought the task that you may be put back in place in the land of your father. Considering that you, Niqmepa, like your nation, are my client ... Next, whether in a state of peace toward me whoever is in a state of peace with me; whether in a state of war whoever is in a state of war with me ... if a foreign enemy springs up against the king of the country of Hatti and should make a campaign in the land of Hatti, and if a rebellion is provoked against the king of the land of Hatti, if Niqmepa is appealed to, then, with his troops he will come rapidly to the reinforcement. ... Next, if, against you, Niqmepa, someone lifts up an issue— whether it be your citizen or some other individual—and if you appeal to the king of the land of Hatti "Come to me in reinforcement!" Well then, the king will come to you with reinforcement. ... As for all the penalties coming from the following countries that the king of the land of Hatti has taken, may Niqmepa stop them and may he send send them to the king of the land of Hatti. ... As for every secret matter, about which the king of the land of Hatti may declare to you, as such a matter that one may absolutely not reveal, well then, if, Niqmepa, you do not keep this matter, you forfeit the

The issues of fugitives and manpower shortages attest to the deportations of populations taking place behind the rhetoric about friendship and protection. It also discusses loyalty and subordination to the great king, offensive and defensive alliances, communications, divine witnesses, warnings, and rewards.²⁹⁴ Ḫattuša, however, had a real economic interest in maintaining the integrity and business interests of the wealthy and entrepreneurial Ugarit.

The following Treaty of Muwattalli II (1295–1272 B.C.E.) with Alakšandu of Wilusa in western Anatolia expresses the usual concerns about alliance, protection, justification, and fugitives:²⁹⁵

§ 1. B I 1. *UM.MA* ^dUTU^{ŠI} ¹NIR.GAL₂ LUGAL GA[L LUGAL KU]R ^{URU}Ḫa-a[t-t]i NA.RA.[AM] ^dU *pi₂-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši* ...
[historical background] § 4 (A I 44') *A.BI.IA e-eš-ḫa-ḫa-a[t]* (45') *pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-ta-pit₂-u₂-it []* (46') *qu-ru-ri-ia-aḫ-ḫi-ir []* (47') *ṭi-i-e-ir nu-mu []* (48') *u₂-ua-nu-un nu-m[u]* (49') *ḫar-ni-in-q[u-un]* ...
[defensive alliance] § 5 (A i 69') *zi-ik 'A-la-ak-ša-an-du-uš* ^dUTU^{ŠI} *aš-šu-li pa-aḫ-ši* (70') *kat-ta-ma am-me-el DUMU-IA DUMU-DUMU-IA ḫa-aš-ša ḫa-an-za-aš-ša pa-aḫ-ši* (71') *nu* ^dUTU^{ŠI} *GIM-an tu-uk 'A-la-ak-ša-an-du-un SIG₅-an-ti me-mi-ni* (72') *IŠ.TU A.UA.AT A.BU.KA pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-ḫa-ḫa-at nu-ut-ta ua-ar-ri u₂-ua-nu-un* (73') *nu-ut-tak₂-kan₂* ^{LU₂}KUR₂-KA *še-ir ku-e-nu-un zi-la-ti ia-ta kat-ta*
[family ties] (74') *[ḫa-aš-ša]a ḫa-an-za-aš-ša tu-e-el DUMU-an am-me-el DUMU^{MES}-IA DUMU.DUMU^{MES}-IA* (75') *[pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš]-ša-an-ta-ri-pit₂ ...*
[offensive alliance] (§ 14 (A iii 4) *ma-a-an* ^dUTU^{ŠI} *a-pi₂-ma KUR-e-a[z] ...* (6) *[la-aḫ-ḫiḡia-m]i nu-mu zi-iq-qa QA.DU ZAB^{MES} ANŠU.QUR* [RA^{MES} (7) *[kat-ṭa-an la-aḫ-ḫ]i-ia-ši ...*
[fugitives] (§ 18 A iii 61–64) *ša* ^{LU₂}MU.U[N.NAB.TI-ma ŠA.PA]L NI.EŠ DINGIR^{LM} *qiš-an [i-ia-nu-un]* (62) *ma-a-an-kan₂* [^{LU₂}MU.NAB.TUM IŠ-TU] KUR-KA KUR ^{URU}[KU₃] BABB[AR-t]i [^{LU₂}*pit₂-ti-ia-an-ti-li*] (63) *u₂-iz-zi [na-an-ta EGIR-pa U₂.UL pi₂-ia-a]n-zi IŠ.TU KUR* ^{URU}[Ḫa-at-ti] (64) ^{LU₂}MU.UN.[NAB.TUM EGIR-pa pi₂-ia-an-]na U₂-UL *a-a-ra ...*
[gods] (§ 19 A iii 80) *nu ka-a-aš-ma a-pi₂-e-da-ni [me-mi-ni* ^dUTU^{ŠI} *'La-ba-ar-na-aš]* (81) [L]UGAL GAL NA.RA.AM ^dU *pi₂-ḫ[a-aš-ša-aš-ši*

treaty. If, from the land of Ḫatti, a refugee flees, may Niqmepa stop him and send him back to the king of the land of Ḫatti. If not, Niqmepa forfeits the treaty. ... We wish here that the thousands of gods may assemble: May they pay attention and may they be witness to the present agreement: the sun-god of heaven, the sun-god of Arinna, the storm-god of heaven, the storm-god of Ḫatti ... the springs, the ocean, the sky, the earth, the winds, and the clouds” [my translation of Kestemont].

²⁹⁴ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 59–64.

²⁹⁵ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 87–93;

LI.IM DINGIR^{MES} (82) [*h*]al-zi-i_h-*h*u-un na-aš ku-ut[-ru-ua-a_h-*h*u-un]
 (83) [*n*]u iš-ta-ma-aš-kan₂-du [*nu* ku-ut-ru-e-eš a-ša-an-du] (§ 20 A
 iv 1) [^dUTU ŠA.ME.E LUGAL KUR.KUR^{MES} LU₂SIP] AD.UDU ŠA
 DUMU.LU₂.GAL₃.LU^dUTU^{URU}A-ri-in-na ...

[punishment] (§ 21 A iv 31) nu-kan₂ ma-a-an zi-iq [¹A-la-ak-ša-an-
 d]u-uš ki-i tup-pi₂-ia-aš (32) [A.]UA.TE^{MES} šar-ra-at-[ti ku-e kue ki-e]-
 da-ni A.NA TUP.PI₂ (33) qi-it-ta-ri nu-ut-ta qu-u[-uš NI.EŠ DINGIR^{LI.M}]
 IŠ.TU SAG.DU-KA (34) DAM-KA DUMU^{MES}-KA KUR.KUR^{MES}-K[A
^{URU}AŠ.AŠ^{HL.A}[-ia]-KA^{GIŠ}SAR.GEŠTIN-KA (35) KISLAH-KA A.ŠAG₃ A.QAR-
 KA GUD^{HL.A}[-KA] UDU^{HL}[^A-K]A QA.D[UMI]M.MU.GA-ia (36) ar-*ha* *har-ni*-
 in-in-kan₂-du nu-ut-*ta*₂-kan₂ NUMUN-KA da-an-ku-ia-az (37) tag₂-
 na-az ar-*ha* *har-ni*-in-kan₂-du²⁹⁶

§ 1. B I 1. The word of the son of Muwattalliš, the great king, the king of the land of Hatti, the loved-one of the storm-god of lightning ... [historical background] § 4 (A i 44') When I seated myself on the throne of my father, you protected me. But when [the men of Arzawa] began war against me, and they entered your land, then you called on me for help. I came and destroyed the land of Masa. ...

[family ties] (74') (A69'–75') You, Alaksandu, protect my majesty, and later protect my son and my grandson, to the first and second generation. As I, my majesty, protected you, Alaksandu, in good will because of the word of our father, and came to your aid, and killed your enemy for you, later in the future my sons and my grandsons will certainly protect your son and grandson for you.

[offensive alliance] (§ 14 (A iii 4) If, I, my majesty, go on campaign from that land ... then you must go on campaign with me, together with infantry and chariotry.

[fugitives] (§ 18 A iii 61–64) I have established the matter of fugitives under oath as follows: if a fugitive comes from your land to Hatti, he will not be given back. It is not permitted to give a fugitive back from Hatti.

[gods] (§ 19 A iii 80–83) I, Labarna, great king beloved of the storm-god of lightning, have now summoned the thousand gods in this matter and have invoked them as witnesses. They shall listen. The sun-god of heaven, king of the lands, shepherd of humankind, the sun-goddess of Arinna, etc. ...

[punishment] (§ 21 A iv 31) If you, Alaksandu, transgress these words of the tablet, which stand on this tablet, then these thousand gods shall eradicate you, together with your person, your wife, our sons our lands, your cities, your vineyard, your threshing floor, your

²⁹⁶ Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches*, 42–102.

field, your cattle, your sheep, and together with your possessions.
They shall eradicate your progeny from the dark earth.

This offensive alliance demands military obligations from Alaksandu. The section called “relations among subordinates” describes the family ties among the rulers of the western Anatolian states: “One will protect the other ... [or] the oath gods will pursue you.” Each stipulation carries a threat from the oath gods. Concerning the fugitives, “it is not permitted to give a fugitive back from Hatti.” The witnesses include gods from western Anatolia: “the sun-god of heaven, king of the lands, shepherd of humankind, sun-goddess of Arinna, queen of the lands,” and a long list of not quite a thousand gods. The treaty includes punishment for transgression: “If you, Alaksandu, transgress these words of the tablet, then these thousand gods will eradicate you.”²⁹⁷ This tablet expresses the inclusive nature of the Hittite pantheon and empire, which sought to bring its subjects into its one big prosperous family.

The following Treaty of Tudḫaliya IV (1227–1209 B.C.E.) with Šaušgamuwa expresses a variation on the usual relationship and introduces the rhetoric of family as an extension of the already extended royal family. It talks about the loyalty to the Tabarna, Tudḫaliya IV, and about the protection from the Hittite military as well as the arrangements of marriages with Hittite royal daughters. The appeal for family familiarity may reflect the increasing threat of Assyria at this late stage of the Hittite empire, as follows:²⁹⁸

(Vs. I) [] ^mTu-ut-ḫa-li-i)a LUGAL.GAL (2) [^dUT]U ^{URU}A-ri-in[-na]
(3) [KUR ^{URU}H]a-at-ti UR.S[AG] ... (8) [tu-uk ^m^dIŠT]AR-mu-u-ua-an
^dUTU^s] ŠU-ta AŠ-BAT] (9) [nu-ud-du-za ^LU² HA-DA-A-NU i-ia-n[u-un]
(10) [nu-ut-ta iš-]ḫi-u₂-la-aš ku-it [tup-pi] (11) [i-ia-nu-un]nu-kan₂
tup-pe₂-aš [] (12) [le-e ua-aḫ-]nu-ši ... (13) [] KUR ^{URU}A-mur-ra
U₂[-UL IŠ-TU ^{GIŠ}T]UKUL] (14) [ŠA KUR ^{URU}Ha-]at-ti tar-aḫ--ḫ[a-an] e-
eš-ta ... (21) [^mA-]zi-ra-aš A-BA-A-BI-KA (22) ^mŠu-up-pi₂-]lu-li-u-
ma-an AŠ-ŠUM EN-UT-TA PAP-aš-ta [] (23) [KUR ^{URU}Ha-a]t-ti-ia pa-
aḫ-ḫa-aš-ta ... (42) ^mHa-at-tu-ši-li-iš LUGAL-iz-zi-at ... (44) ^mPe₂-
en-te-ši-na-an A-BU-KA I-NA KUR A-mur-ri (45) LUGAL-un ... (Vs.
II) (2) [] ... nu-ut-ta NIN-IA DAM-an[-ni] (3) pi₂-iḫ-ḫu-un nu-ut-ta I-
NA KUR ^{URU}A-mur-ri LUGAL-un DU₃-nu-un (4) nu AŠ-ŠUM EN-UT-TI
^dUTU^ši PAP-ši kat-ta-ia DUMU^{MEŠ} DUMU.DUMU^{MEŠ} (5) NUMUN ŠA
^dUTU^ši AŠ-ŠUM EN-UT-TI PAP-ši (6) ta-ma-i-za EN-UT-TA le-e i-la-li[-
ia-š]i (7) ka-a-aš-ta me-mi-aš ŠA-PAL NI-EŠ DINGIR^{LIM} ki-it-ta-ru ...
(Rs. IV) (12) LUGAL KUR AŠ-šur A-NA ^dUTU^ši GIM-an ku-ru-ur (13)
tu-uq-qa-aš QA-TAM-MA ku-ru-ur e-eš-du

²⁹⁷ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 92.

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 104–6; Singer, “Treaties,” 98–99; Kühne and Otten, *Der Šaušgamusa-Vertrag*, 6–15; KUB XXXIII 1; Szemerényi, “Vertrag des Hethiterkönigs Tudḫaliya IV,” 9:113–29.

[Thus says Tabarna] Tudḫaliya, great king, (2) [] king of Hatti, beloved of the sun-goddess of Arinna, (3) [son of Ḫattušili, the great king, king] of Ḫatti, the hero. ... (8) I, my majesty, have made you Šaušgamuwa [my] brother-in-law. You shall not alter the words of the treaty. ... (13) Historically, the land of Amurru was not by means of (14) military force conquered by Ḫatti land. ... (21) Aziru, your great-great-grandfather was loyal to him [Šuppiluliuma] and to the land of Ḫatti. ... (42) Ḫattušili made Bentešima, your father, king in the land of Amurru. ... (Vs. II) (2) I gave you my sister in marriage and have made you king in the land of Amurru. (4) Protect my majesty as overlord. And later protect the sons, grandsons, and offspring of my majesty as overlords. (6) You shall not desire some other overlord for yourself. (7) This matter shall be placed under oath for you. ... (12) Since the king of Assyria is my majesty's enemy, he shall also be your enemy.

In this treaty, Tudḫaliya uses the name or title Tabarna for the first time, and the historical and legal prologue talks about loyalty and protection. This treaty equates loyalty with family in a form of ideology. The threat of the encroaching Assyria might have caused Ḫattuša to adopt a more conciliatory and less threatening attitude to the subject states upon whom they relied as military buffer zones.

4.5. *Treaty Theory of Ḫattuša*

Treaty theory of Ḫattuša relied on the so-called self-subordinated countries that, according to the rhetoric of the historical and legal prologue, accepted the legal argument that justified their subordination and subjugation to the Great King, according to Altman.²⁹⁹ Aziru, for instance, had submitted to Šuppiluliuma I although Aziru, the runaway slave, had also submitted to a Hurrian lord. Although this principle of justification appears consistent, actual treaties depended on the local circumstances, the historical relationship, and the immediate political considerations. According to the language of the protection treaties, the self-subjugated countries sought legal and contractual protection from Ḫattuša for which they paid in tribute and in loyalty in the form of troops. In such self-subjugated kingdoms, the Hittite Great King made no claim of ownership of their land.

The principles inherent in the treaties, according to Klengel, also constituted the basis upon which the Hittites administered their international relationships. The term for treaty, *išhiul* (bond) referred to the unilateral imposition of subordination and protection on a conquered or submissive state,

²⁹⁹ Altman, "Rethinking the Hittite System," 741–47.

and the verb *išhai* (to bind) corresponds to the Akkadian *riksu* and *rikiltu/rikistu* (bond, responsibility). The Hittite term *lingai-* corresponds to the Akkadian *māmītu* (oath). In return for Hittite protection, the subordinated state supplied troops and paid tribute. The states contracted to return fugitives, who had escaped from Hittite slavery and military service. The treaties threatened destruction for disobedience or the breaking of an oath but promised prosperity for cooperation and participation in the *pax Hethitica*.³⁰⁰

The Hittites, according to Beckman, recognized no middle ground in their international relationships but considered foreign states either a friend or an enemy. Both sides of the treaties swore in the presence of the gods of both sides and thus formed the treaty of the *rikis māmīti* (contract of oath). The treaties often add clauses concerning the initiation or maintenance of family ties depending on the closeness of the friendship between the imperial power and the protected state. For conquered states with rulers from the extended royal family, the Hittites employed an internal contract of oath to define and to control the assimilated states such as Arzawa, Kizzuwatna, and Mittanni.³⁰¹

The historical prologues of the Hittite treaties, according to Altman, serve the following functions: First, they appear in subordination or protection treaties in which Ḫattuša imposed a unilateral dominance on a lesser state (e.g., Šuppiluliuma I over Niqmaddu). Second, in describing the events that led up to the avowing of a treaty, they serve rather as legal prologues or justification for the imposition of the legal protected status of subject: “I am a subject of the Sun.” Third, in their role as legal justification for the imposition of a legal relationship, they fit into the pattern, which stems from the earliest Inscription of Anitta and the Annals of Ḫattušili I, of writing down self-defensive justifications, or apologies, to the gods for their conquest and destruction of neighboring cities and countries. Thus the Hittites did not write the historical introduction for the satisfaction of the subordinated and protected party, for an appeal to their conscience, but rather as a self-defensive justification written for the gods of their own divine court.³⁰²

The subjects of Ḫattuša swore oaths of loyalty before the gods of both sides as witnesses, and before the assembly of gods as a judicial tribunal, Ḫattuša presented the historical prologue. Such a procedure enforced by military power did not reflect the moral norms or the divine legal procedure of the ancient Near East accepted by parties and presupposed by the people involved as Altman proposed.³⁰³ If so, the treaties would have held up without Hittite military power. If the treaties had appealed to common legal and religious concepts, then the kings would not have disrespected and broken the treaties whenever the Hittites let up on their military pressure.

³⁰⁰ Klengel, *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*, 367.

³⁰¹ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 1.

³⁰² Altman, *Historical Prologue*, 13–42.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, 38.

The historical and legal prologues thus represented unilateral, self-justifying legal arguments imposed by force of arms for the purpose of the imperial conquerors to plunder, to own, and to rule foreign countries, according to Altman. The legal arguments justify the political domination of the subordinate party and deprive the subordinate party of the ability to contest the validity and the legality of the treaty. Unilateral treaties that impose domination require such justification. The self-subjugation, however, took place in a context of imminent annihilation, death, and slavery.³⁰⁴

4.6. *Ḫattuša and the DH Covenant*

Could the seventh-century-B.C.E. authors of the DH have derived their imperial covenant relationship with their god from the traditions of international subjugation treaties of the second millennium B.C.E. empire of Ḫattuša? The important elements in the treaties—the historical and legal prologue, the proliferation of gods, and the binary division between destruction and prosperity—have relevance to the discussion. This chapter has gone behind the formal aspects of the treaties and taken a broader view of Hittite culture in order to find the deeper issues and presuppositions of the treaties, which begin with the related issues of the religion, war, and the process of imperial subjugation.

A comparison of Ḫattuša's religion to the DH's religious demand of absolute obedience to YHWH and the *nābî'im*, reveals both similarities and differences. The great king of Ḫattuša demanded submission, subjugation, loyalty, and obedience from his subjects but had them swear their oaths of loyalty in the presence of their gods and the gods of Ḫattuša. YHWH of the DH has no tolerance for *'ēlōhîm 'āḥērîm* and did not allow his enemies the Canaanites the opportunity to submit and to contract a treaty. Instead the DH god claimed to form an international-style treaty with his own followers to conquer the land but at the same time took the role of a commanding general and led the army to war.

Although Ḫattuša had scribes and scholars, who must have advised the king, they remained invisible and did not write their authority over the kings into the literature. Thus no visible trace of an authoritative institution of the *nābî'* appears in Hittite literature.

Ḫattuša uses a variant sense of legal justification that derives from past acts of loyalty and the agreement of parties as the legality of submission. It differs from the DH principle of obedience to a military command from the god. The historical prologue of the DH consists of a reminder of the people's relationship of dependence on YHWH. YHWH of the DH treats his own people as subjects of his empire. The DH does not discuss the historical relationship

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 46, 57.

of the foreign population with YHWH or the king but targets them for total destruction and annihilation.

The two imperial doctrines, however, share a sense of crime as a breach of loyalty or obedience. In the DH, however, the aggressive god does not give the enemy the benefit of the doubt and orders their destruction. As the people proceed to disobey YHWH by keeping foreigners in their midst, he orders their destruction as well. Although the Hittites did suffer from the presence of large numbers of slave populations in their midst, their royal literature does not deal with the problem.

Both imperial systems experienced contradictions between the imperial rule and the patrimonial form of succession. The Hittite practice of placing royal family members in administrative positions in the empire created problems of loyalty and obedience. The DH passage about the permanent dynasty of David reflects nonimperialist interests of the local family power structure to exercise permanent rule over the nation.

Both systems allowed for usurpation of the crown by powerful and capable military commanders and for the genre of apology literature for usurpation of patrimonial and monarchical rule. The Apologies of Ḫattušili III and Suppiluliuma I, and that of David of the DH, represent the imperial principle of usurpation of authority in the interests of the military strength of the empire.

The imperial focus on the great king made the empire appear as if guided by a single power like the commander god of the DH, but the imperial Hittite powers included the priests of the temples of sun-goddess of Arinna and the storm-god of Heaven and the assembly of nobles and owners of the great estates (*panku*). The king and the gods formed the ideological core of the empire but needed the consensus and the financial power of the *panku* in order to pay for the military campaigns.

From the beginning Pithana and Anitta devoted cities to annihilation in service to the sun goddess of Arinna and the storm-god of Ḫattuša. Although the Hittites offered mercy to submissive cities, they still plundered the land and the goods as property of the storm-god. The imperial policy aimed at plunder and wealth rather than long-term political stability. This policy of annihilation and consecration of resistant cities does resemble the DH policy of annihilation of the population of Canaan, yet YHWH of the DH gave the Canaanites no opportunity to submit and ordered their destruction because of their inherent evil of living on YHWH's land. By contrast as well, the DH policy aimed at permanent transformation of the land in the image of YHWH's will rather than just as an outpost of material goods to plunder at will.

The Hittite ideology of imperial war in pursuit of ancestral land came clothed in legalistic terms that posed war as a lawsuit, and victory constituted a positive moral verdict from the god. The Hittites developed the treaty as an imperial tool to justify conquest through the means of the divine court, which consisted of Hittite gods and their dependents. The treaties existed for

submissive cities and cooperative rulers because recalcitrant rulers met with devotion to annihilation. The DH justified its conquest of Canaan by command of YHWH and offered no justification beyond that command. The DH did not offer its enemies the possibility of submission or treaty of subjugation. Instead YHWH of the DH imposed a subjugation treaty on his own population and its leaders.

The Hittite subjugation treaties, therefore, constituted self-justified legal domination of submissive rulers and expressed divine causality predicated upon human past actions. The DH also assumes a self-justified domination of its submissive followers from their historical relationship. It assumes that YHWH causes things according to his commands and kills anyone who disobeys or resists his will.

The historical and legal prologue both justified the political domination of a kingdom and isolated it from its neighbors by disallowing another alliance outside of the empire. The DH accomplishes the same goal by isolating the followers of YHWH from their neighbors. The continued presence of those other people in the land offended YHWH.

The treaty made the subject a secure member of the empire but at the same time imposed subordination. Šuppiluliuma I, in particular, used the rhetoric of friendship, loyalty, and protection to mask his destruction of local ruling elites. Muršili II and Muwattalli II wrote treaties that presupposed the submission of their subjects and dealt with other legal matters such as fugitives, manpower, protection, and friendship. As DH scholarship has pointed out, the DH uses language of friendship and love in its rhetoric about YHWH.

Hittite treaty theory presupposed the self-subordination of intimidated rulers, who accepted the legal arrangement of subjugation and thereby profited by cooperating in the imperial market. Followers of YHWH of the DH also profited from their subjugation to YHWH and the acquisition of land by conquest and from the extensive imperial conquests of subsequent strong kings.

The Hittite principle of international behavior consisted of the *išhiul* (bond) between friends. Enemies met with war. On the home front, the same principle operated by means of the internal contract and sworn oath between friends and family members. The rhetoric of the DH includes a sworn oath of the people before YHWH on the mount Horeb and the declaration of war against their enemies residing in their ancestral land.

Problems for the Hittite policies included the following: The Hittite focus on extended family members as governors and local rulers of captured lands, however, caused problems for the empire as family members owed allegiance but not obedience. The tension between imperial rule and patrimonial monarchical rule appears in the DH as well in the claims of the Davidic patrimony as a dynasty over the nation. That claim also caused a split in the imperial uniformity of the nation.

The Hittite respect for other gods also produced weaknesses in the empire because it left local power structures and elites in place with the power to re-

bel. YHWH of the DH had no respect for *ʾēlōhīm ʾāḥērīm* but could not get rid of them, and they, too, caused the demise of the nation.

Massive imports of deported populations from defeated cities over the long-term replaced missing Hittite population lost to wars and left the homeland open to internal disintegration. The ongoing presence of insubmissive Canaanite populations in the midst of YHWH's kingdom led in a similar way to its internal disintegration.

Ḫattuša's policy of legal conquest, devotion, and destruction of resistant populations does match in general the command of YHWH in the DH for conquest and annihilation, which presupposes the legality and sanctity of the command of YHWH to conquer the land. The army of Ḫattuša devoted cities to the storm-god because of their resistance or rebellion, and such consecration meant annihilation, burning, and destruction of the land and subsequent delivery of plunder and deportees to the temples. The DH records the same policy. Ḫattuša, however, tried to balance the threat of annihilation with a promise of prosperity and, as in the case with Ugarit, protected the commercial activities of its prosperous subjects. Ḫattuša did not ever have a policy, a law, or an ideology of complete destruction of a population for the crime of inhabiting the land of their god.

The kings of Ḫattuša and their patrimonial appointees owed service to the gods but did not answer to an authoritative and assertive class of advisors in service of the god. Religious duties compelled the king to serve at ceremonies year round and often kept him from campaigning. The king stood at the top of the administrative hierarchy and did not take orders from his scholars or priests. The patrimonial appointees of the king to administrative posts around the empire weakened the close links of obedience and loyalty to the crown and to the god that a more military organization might have had. Royal family appointees owed loyalty but not obedience and often created problems for the central authority. Ḫattuša thus lacked a single god to whom officers, appointees, and treaty rulers swore oaths. An oath to the great king did not carry the same weight as an oath to a universal and omnipotent god such as that of the DH.

The Hittite policy of punishment for rebellion might have contributed to its ultimate demise. Because they did not have a secure system of treaty that could survive without military force and because of the policy of making patrimonial appointments in the conquered territories, they had to conquer stubborn lands over and over. This procedure weakened the army by attrition and destabilized the homeland because of the large influxes of foreign slaves to replace the labor lost to the army. These built-in instabilities, such as the external unilateral militarism and the internal fusion of patrimonialism with politics, contributed to the failure of the Hittite empire at the end of the Bronze Age. The nation of the DH suffered a similar calamity because of its concessions to patrimonial rule, its focus on conquest and punishment, and

the continual presence of insubmissive Canaanites in its midst. The foreigners so offended YHWH that, according to the DH, he destroyed the state.

The DH shares the concept of imperial legal conquest at the command of the state's highest authority. In the Hittite world, the historical relationships played a propagandistic and secondary role to the fact and threat of military conquest and dominance in the subjugation treaties. Vast differences in religion, chronology, geography, and economy of the empire, however, exclude the Hittite empire from consideration as the source of the covenant in the DH. Although the Great King might have resembled YHWH of the DH in his role as central authority figure, the Hittite sun-god of Arinna, the storm-god of Ḫattuša, and the Thousand Gods of the empire indicated a dominant but inclusive empire. The Hittites conquered and destroyed resistant cities but contracted with compliant and lucrative cities under military force and then left them alone as long as they paid their tribute.

The Hittite empire flourished in Anatolia and northern Syria during the second millennium B.C.E., never approached southern Canaan, and vanished from history centuries before the advent of the DH. The weakened Neo-Hittite states of the northern Levant did not project power or influence into Canaan. The Hittites possessed and tolerated a large inclusive pantheon of Hittite, Mittanian, and Anatolian gods that they plundered from the far reaches of their empire. The Hittite empire managed its subjects for the purpose of maximizing trade and business connections. Although they transported large numbers of resistant populations into their heartland to serve as slaves, they did not have a policy of systematic annihilation and assimilation of subject populations. Their treaties reveal a policy of reliance on loyalty and cooperation and did not require absolute obedience to the gods, the Great King, or the imperial administrators. Although sharing some key components, the Hittite empire and its treaty theory do not appear as the source or precedent of the deuteronomistic covenant.

CHAPTER 5: NEO-ASSYRIAN IMPERIAL IDEOLOGY

This chapter will consist of an investigation into Neo-Assyrian (NA) imperial ideology, policy, and law of the first millennium B.C.E. during its hegemony over the Levant. The evidence for this investigation comes, first, from a survey of the scholarship concerning the Neo-Assyrian imperial ideology and its historical reality. Second, evidence of change and consistency in the ideology and the policy and its legal enforcement comes from the Neo-Assyrian imperial inscriptions from Aššurnāṣirpal II to Aššurbanipal.

5.1. *Survey of the Scholarship*

Assyrian imperial civilization during the first millennium B.C.E., according to Grayson, had the following general characteristics. The king served the supreme god Aššur and held a position of absolute power over the state and the military. The state bureaucracy had a military organization that included the scribes as part of the structure. Installation in an office in the empire required an oath of loyalty to the king. With its increasing military power, Assyria developed, first, the *adû* treaty method of dealing with its intimidated subjects but then, later, imposed conquest, annihilation, deportation, and provincial administration under a repopulated area. The agricultural economy supported Assyria's army, and the army expanded the agricultural lands. The empire profited from plunder, tribute, and taxation on trade from subject states and provinces. Succeeding empires, like that of Babylon, modeled their warfare and military organization on that of Assyria, whose war strategy had included psychological warfare and terror. Polytheism and cult marked domestic Assyrian religion, but the imperial god Aššur ruled as king of gods, mankind, and the four quarters. Babylonian culture and the gods Ellil, Marduk, and Nabû influenced Assyrian religion.³⁰⁵

Tadmor's literary analysis supports the importance of the imperial inscriptions that express a semiotic code in which the king represents the heroic principle of royal omnipotence acting under the command of the god Aššur to conquer and to expand the land Aššur. The scribes wrote the code into the historical annals of the king's endeavors, and each inscription mirrored the conditions and concerns of the scribal and political elite of the period.³⁰⁶

The image of the king (*šalam šārrūtu*) on the Neo-Assyrian imperial inscriptions, according to Irene Winter, presents the king in the likeness of the god Aššur.³⁰⁷ The *šalam šārrūtu*—for example, in the figure below (fig. 1), of Tiglath-pileser III—thus served to support the claim of the imperial inscription that the king had the divine sanction to conquer and to rule by

³⁰⁵ Grayson, "Assyrian Civilization," 194–228.

³⁰⁶ Tadmor, "Propaganda, Literature, Historiography," 326, 334, 335.

³⁰⁷ Winter, "Art in Empire," 359–81; Relief of Tiglath-pileser III. British Museum.

means of his authority as the servant of Aššur and as the supreme commander of the awe-inspiring radiance (*melammû*). Winter's view of the ideal *šalam šārrûtu* as the likeness of Aššur and the *melammû* as the means to transform the world through its terrifying brilliance has particular significance in view of Tiglath-pileser III's aggressive and enforced law of annexation of the world in the image and service of Aššur.



Figure 1. Relief of Tiglath-pileser III in the Image of Aššur. Text 18.
Central Palace, Kalḫu. British Museum 118908.
Photograph courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

The Assyrian kings, according to Oded, projected power by command of Aššur, which they received through a *tērtum* (oracle) or through *bīru* (divination).³⁰⁸ The god Aššur possessed absolute universal authority to determine personal, state, and international matters including those of war and

³⁰⁸ Oded, *War, Peace, and Empire*.

peace and natural events. Thus the god Aššur commanded Aššurnāṣirpal II to conquer his enemies, as follows:

e-nu-ma Aš-šur EN GAL-ú na-bu-ú MU-ia ... GIŠ.TUKUL-šú la pa-da-a ana i-di EN-ti-a lu-šat-mi-iḫ KUR.KUR.MEŠ ḫur-ša-a-ni KAL.MEŠ ana pe-li šuk-nu-še u šá-pa-ri ag-giš ú-ma-i-ra-ni ina GIŠ.tukulti Aš-šur EN-ia.

When Aššur, my great lord, who called me by name ... had placed his merciless weapon in my lordly arms, and in his anger had commanded me to conquer and to subdue and to rule, with the help of Aššur, my lord.³⁰⁹

Aššur religion thus justified war because the Assyrians did not separate it from their political ideology, as Oded notes. The kings perceived themselves as shepherds, who promoted world peace by spreading terror and fear (*hattu u puluḫti*) and demanding obedience (*tašmû*). Royal titles reflect the imperial ideology: *šar kiššati* (king of universe), *kibrāt arba'im/terbetti* (king of four quarters), *šar gimri* (king of universe), *bēl bēlē* (lord of lords), *šar šarrāni* (king of kings). They express the supremacy of the servant of Aššur over other kings and the whole world and deny equality to other kings or gods.³¹⁰

The Assyrian empire considered absolute obedience its prime virtue, and disobedience constituted stubbornness (*šepšu* or *zā'iru*) or hostility (*nakru*), which merited punishment, according to Oded. The world could not have peace (*salimu*) without obedience (*tašmû*). Compulsory fear and reverence of Aššur shaped the religion of loyalty and obedience to Aššur. Although foreign princes did not have to relinquish their own religion at first, eventual annihilation of the state structure and deportation of the populations into the extremities of the empire resulted in complete assimilation to the empire. Conquered non-Assyrians became Assyrian by virtue of their submission, loyalty, and obedience.³¹¹

The king had the primary duty to expand the borders of Aššur's land by projection of military power, according to Tadmor. The command appears as early as the second-millennium-B.C.E. royal ritual of Tukulti-Ninurta I: "Extend your land!" (*mātka rappiṣ*). Aššurbanipal's scepter (*hattu*) symbolized his duty to shepherd the people, and his mace (*kakku*) symbolized his duty to conquer land and to expand the empire of Aššur. The Assyrians set up monuments (*šalmu*) in distant lands to mark the presence of the Assyrian king's imperial authority.³¹² Later, Tiglath-pileser III conquered more land than any other king as he wrote on his *šalmu*: "I ... personally conquered all

³⁰⁹ Budge and King, *Annals*, 267–68; Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 2), 196.

³¹⁰ Oded, *War*, 166.

³¹¹ Ibid., 175–90.

³¹² Tadmor, "World Dominion," 55–62.

the lands. ... I marched to and fro and ruled the world.”³¹³ Esarhaddon expressed the task thus: “To attack, to plunder, to extend the border of *māt Aššur*”³¹⁴

The Assyrians saw Aššur as the totality of gods (*gabbu-ilani-Aššur*), according to Parpola, and this epithet reflected the structure of the Assyrian empire with the king as representative of Aššur at the center of a multinational organization of lesser officials and rulers.³¹⁵ An imperial society requires such an organization in order to maintain its hold on power, according to Liverani, and ideology facilitates the ability of the organization to exploit its victims by convincing them to act in the interests of the empire. The empire breaks down the local power structures of its conquered states by means of deportations, linguistic uniformity, and provincial administration in order to make them all Assyrians. Ideology serves to impose the order, authority, and economic exploitation of the center upon the chaotic and failed periphery.³¹⁶

These studies of the empire thus indicate a military society sustained by its agricultural wealth and driven by an ideology of a universal god. That god, by means of his servant the king, commands the national army to project its power into the peripheral regions, to transform those regions into Assyrian lands, and to establish the jurisdiction of the god into the known world. The god’s command to project imperial power constitutes the official policy and law of the empire enforced by the army and the administrative structure. The god commands obedience from foreigner and Assyrian alike, and disobedience or rebellion brings annihilation. The following inscriptions will bring out details of the development of the ideology and the law of the empire under the emperors of the first millennium B.C.E.

5.2. Aššurnāṣirpal II (883–859 B.C.E.)

Aššurnāṣirpal II’s long inscription engraved on the Ninurta temple of Kalḫu begins with a dedication to the god Ninurta. Although appearing in Ninurta’s temple and addressed to that god, the dedication proceeds to address the god Aššur and contains some of the important themes of the imperial ideology that will continue throughout the ensuing centuries of the Assyrian empire, as the following passage indicates:

(1) *ana* ^dMAŠ *geš-ri dan-dan-ni* MAḪ SAG.KAL DINGIR.MEŠ UR.SAG
šar-ḫu git₂-ma-lu ša₂ ina ME₃ *la-a iš-ša₂-na-nu ...* (3) DINGIR *ša₂*
ina ba-lu-šu₂ EŠ.BAR an-e u ki-tim NU KUD-su ... (4) *ša₂ la-a e-nu-*

³¹³ Ibid., 56.

³¹⁴ Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 98, 34–35.

³¹⁵ Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*.

³¹⁶ Liverani, “Ideology of the Assyrian Empire,” 297–317.

u₂ q_{i2}-bit KA-š_{u2} ... (7) *sa-pin* KUR KUR₂.MEŠ *mu-u₂-šam-qit tar-gi-gi* ... (8) *mu-ab-bit lem-nu-te mu-šak-niš la ma-gi-ri mu-ḫal-liq za-ia-a-ri* ... š_{a2} *ina* UKKIN DINGIR.MEŠ (9) MU-š_{u2} DINGIR *ma-am-ma la* BAL-*u₂ qa-a-iš* TI-LA DINGIR REM₂-*u₂*.³¹⁷

(1) To the god Ninurta, powerful, almighty, proud, preeminent of the gods, splendid perfect warrior, who in battle has no equal ... (3) god that without whom no decisions are made in heaven and earth ... (4) whose command does not change ... (7) who overwhelms the lands and causes evildoers to fall ... (8) who destroys evil completely, who subdues the disobedient, who destroys enemies ... (9) whose command no god of the assembly changes ... who grants life, compassionate god.

Aššurnāširpal II's text introduces a warrior god, Ninurta, with regal and imperial characteristics. His decisions cover heaven and earth, and his command does not change. He overwhelms foreign countries, subdues those who disagree, and destroys his enemies. Ninurta destroys evil and enemies but grants life and compassion to those who follow him.

The following text elevates Aššurnāširpal's image as a strong king, who conquers with the support of the god Aššur:

(9) ^maš-šur-PAB-A MAN *dan-nu* (10) MAN ŠU₂ MAN *la ša₂-na-an* MAN *kul₂-lat kib-rat 4-ta* ^dšam-šu *kiš-šat* UN.MEŠ *ni-šit* ^dBAD *u* ^dMAŠ *na-ra-am* ^da-nim (11) *u* ^dda-gan *ka-šu-uš* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ ... š_{a2} SANGA-su UGU (12) DINGIR-ti-ka GAL-ti *i-ṭi₂-bu-ma tu-šar-ši-du* BAL-š_{u2} *eṭ-lu qar-du* š_{a2} *ina* GIŠ.tukul-ti *aš-šur* EN-š_{u2} DU.DU-kuma... (13) SIPA *tab-ra-ate la a-di-ru* GIŠ.LAL *e-du-u₂ gap-šu₂ ša₂ ma-ḫi-ra* (14) *la-a* TUK-*u₂ MAN mu-šak-niš*^{iš3} *la-a kan-šu-te-šu₂ ša₂ nap-ḫar kiš-šat* UN.MEŠ *i-pe-lu NITA₂ dan-nu mu-kab-bi-is* (15) GU₂ *a-a-bi-šu₂ kul-lat* KUR₂.MEŠ *mu-pa-ri-ru* ... (16) KUR.KUR.MEŠ DU₃-*ši-na qat-su* ... *bi-lat-su-nu im-ḫu-ru ša-bit* (17) *li-i-ṭi₂ ša₂-kin li-i-te* UGU DU₃-*ši-na* KUR.KUR.MEŠ.³¹⁸

(9) Aššurnāširpal, strong king, (10) king of the world, king not equaled, king of all the four quarters, sun-god of all peoples, elevated one of gods Enlil and Ninurta, loved of gods Anu (11) and Dagan, weapon of the great gods ... whose priesthood (12) pleases your great divinity, and you established his year of reign; heroic man, who goes with the support of Aššur ... (13) wonderful shepherd, who knows no fear of battle, a flood that has (14) no opponent, king who makes those not submissive to him submit, who

³¹⁷ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 2), 193–94.

³¹⁸ Ibid., 194–95; Aššurnāširpal II, A.0.101.20.

rules the whole world of peoples; strong man who treads on the neck of his enemies, who disperses all of his enemies, (16) who conquers the lands ... who received their tribute, who captured (17) hostages, who claimed victory over all the lands.

This inscription emphasizes Aššurnāširpal II's strength as a king of the world and as a ruler of the extended territory of the "four quarters," which extended across the Fertile Crescent. It equates Aššurnāširpal II with the sun-god of justice, ^dŠamaš, and points out his favorable relationships with the other gods. Thus justified by divine consent, Aššurnāširpal II serves as a priest to the gods and wins the support of the god Aššur. As a military leader, Aššurnāširpal II leads the troops into battle and brings uncooperative lands into submission. He conquers the world, rules it, disperses his enemies, and claims victory over opponents. Aššurnāširpal II serves the god Aššur as conqueror and ruler of the world. After dispersing his enemies and those not submissive, Aššurnāširpal II kept his foot on their necks, took hostages, and received tribute from them. His mission appears focused on forcing submission from enemy lands and plundering their possessions. In this early part of the inscription from the Ninurta temple in Kalḫu, Aššurnāširpal II pays homage to the gods—Šamaš, Enlil, Anu, and Dagan—but serves Aššur in the endeavor of projecting power into the four corners of the world and justifying that endeavor as a service to the god. Aššurnāširpal II's inscription implies a dire fate to anyone who might have considered not complying with his demands or commands: he "makes those not submissive to him submit."

The same inscription from the Ninurta temple of Kalḫu, which began with the dedication to the god Ninurta above, moves on to discuss the deeds and duties of Aššurnāširpal II, who now appears to serve in the office of king under the authority of the god Aššur. The relationship between Ninurta and Aššur has to do with the Assyrians' association of gods with cities: Aššur city with Aššur, Nineveh and Arba'il with Ištar, Calah with Ninurta, and Harran with Sîn. Šamaš and Adad did not have cities. Aššur, however, as king of gods and imperial god of the military, ruled the gods, mankind, and the universe as sovereign, lord, father, creator, sage, and warrior. Ninurta, the first-born son of Aššur, had the limited role of god of warfare and hunting, as the following text illustrates:³¹⁹

(17) *e-nu-ma aš-šur* EN *na-bu-u₂* MU-*a mu-šar-bu-u₂* MAN-*ti-a* (18) GIŠ.TUKUL-*š_{u2}* *la pa-da-a a-na i-da-at* EN-*ti-a lu it-muḫ* ^m*aš-šur-PAB-A* ... (19) *ka-šid* URU.URU ... (21) LUGAL LUGAL.MEŠ-*ni i-ši-pu na-a'-du ni-bit* ^dMAŠ *qar-di ka-šu-uš* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ *mu-tir gi-mil-li* 22) MAN *ša₂ ina* GIŠ.tukul-*ti aš-sur u* ^d*ša₂-maš* DINGIR.MEŠ

³¹⁹ Grayson, "Assyrian Civilization," 222–23.

tik-li-šu me-še-riš DU-ku-ma ... (23) kul₂-lat KUR.KUR.MEŠ-šu₂-nu ana GIR₃.IL.MEŠ-šu₂ u₂-šek₂-ni-ša₂ ... (27) KUR₂.MEŠ-ut aš-šur paṭ gim-ri-šu₂-nu e-liš u KI.TA iš-ta-na-nu-ma GUN u ma-da-tu₂ (28) UGU-šu₂-nu u₂-ki-nu ka-šid a-a-bu-ut aš-šur.³²⁰

(17) When Aššur, the lord, the one who called my name, he who makes my kingship great, (18) his merciless weapon in the arms of my lordship was grasped. Aššurnaširpal ... (19) conqueror of cities ... (21) king of kings, attentive purification priest, named by Ninurta, heroic divine weapon of the great gods, avenger, (22) king, who acts justly with the support of the gods Aššur and Šamaš, ... (23) who set all the lands at his feet. ... (27) He opposed continually the enemies of Aššur at all of their borders above and below. He imposed tribute and tax on them, the conqueror of the enemies of Aššur.

In this part of the inscription, the text describes the preeminence of the god Aššur and the king's role as warrior and priest in the service of Aššur. The king appears both to have a merciless weapon (GIŠ.TUKUL-šu₂ la pa-da-a) and to act as a heroic divine weapon (*qar-di ka-šu-uš*) himself. He has the duties of a purification priest and of an avenger, who acts in the just service of both Aššur and Šamaš. The text, however, leaves out mention of Enlil, Anu, and Dagan. The king opposes the enemies of Aššur, conquers them, and imposes tribute and tax on them. Service to Aššur includes setting the lands at the feet of the god and opposing the god's enemies.

This part of the Kalḫu dedication spells out the duties of the king to the god Aššur. Whereas, for example, in the previous section, the text described the god Ninurta as having the role of provider of life and compassion, here the text defines the king's role as opposing Aššur's enemies with the merciless weapon and thus bringing justice, which consists of conquest and the imposition of tribute. The GIŠ.TUKUL-šu₂ la pa-da-a appears to refer to the authority invested in the king as part of his office of king (*šarrūtu*) to mobilize and to command the army as the means to accomplish the service of Aššur. The infraction of an enemy incurs the anger of Aššur, who employs the king as his weapon of vengeance and punishment.

The same long inscription from the temple of Ninurta in Kalḫu continues and begins the king's annals, now in the voice of Aššurnaširpal II, with his acknowledgment of the source of authority for his office, as follows:

(i 31) ina u₄-me-šu₂-ma ina pi DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ MAN-ti EN-ti kiš-šu₂-ti E₃-a (32) MAN-ku be-la-ku. ... (40) e-nu-ma aš-šur ... (42) KUR.KUR.MEŠ ḫur-ša₂-ni KAL.MEŠ a-na pe-li šuk-nu-še u₃ ša₂-pa-ri

³²⁰ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 2), 195; Aššurnaširpal II, A.O.101.20.

*ag-giš u₂-ma-²i-ra-ni. ... (45) u₂-šat-mi₃-²hu GIŠ.GIGIT.MEŠ ERIN₂.²HI.A.MEŠ-a ... (46) a-na KUR tum₄-me a-lik URU li-be₂-e ... (48) ²HI.A a-duk šal-la-su-nu GU₄.MEŠ-š_u₂-nu aš₂-lu-la ... (53) URU.MEŠ-ni-š_u₂-nu (54) ap-pul₂ aq-qur ina IZI. MEŠ GIBIL₂-up ... (57) me-lam-me š_a₂ aš-šur EN-ia is-²hup-š_u₂-nu. ... (66) ERIN₂.MEŠ am-mar TA IGI GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-a ip-par₂-š²i-du-ni ur-du-ni GIR₃.II.MEŠ-ia (67) DIB-tu₂ GUN ma-da-tu u LU₂ za-bil₂ ku-du-ri UGU-š_u₂-nu aš-kun ... (74) aq-²ti₂-rib GUN ma-da-tu₂ š_a₂ KUR ... (80) pul₂-²hi me-lam-me š_a₂ aš-šur EN-ia is-²hup-š_u₂-nu ^{LU2}GAL.MEŠ ^{LU2}ŠU.GI.MEŠ URU a-na šu-zu-ub ZI.MEŠ-š_u₂-nu a-na GABA-ia E₃-ni (81) GIR₃.II-a iš-bu-tu₂ ... (99) ina qi₂-bit aš-šur ... ^{LU2}GAR.KUR KUR Su-²hi ... ma-da-tu-š_u₂ ana URU ni-nu-a UGU-a lu ub-la. ... (105) ša-lam MAN-ti-ia ab-ni it-ti-š_u₂-nu u₂-še-zi-iz ... (107) ina gi-piš ERIN₂.²HI.A.MEŠ-A ME₃-a šit-mu-ri URU a-si-bi KUR-ad 8 ME ERIN₂.MEŠ mu-ta²h-š²i-š_u₂-nu (108) ina GIŠ.TUKUL u₂-šam-qit 3 LIM šal-la-š_u-nu ina IZI.MEŠ GIBIL₂ ki-i li-²tu-te I-en ina ŠA₃-š_u₂-nu TILLA ul e-zib. ... (114) ERIN₂.MEŠ a-na BAD₃.MEŠ-š_u₂-nu dan-nu-te u₃ ERIN₂.²HI.A.MEŠ-š_u-nu ²HI.A.MEŠ it-tak₃-lu-ma la ur-da-ni (115) GIR₃.II.MEŠ-a la-a iš-bu-tu₂ i-na mit-²hu-š²i u ti-du-ki URU a-si-bi KUR-ad.
 (ii 9) si-ta-at KUR ni-ir-bi š_a₂ TA IGI GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-a ip-par₂-š²i-du-ni (10) ur-da-ni GIR₃.II.MEŠ-a iš-bu-tu₂ URU.DIDLI-š_u₂-nu E₂.²HI.A.MEŠ-š_u₂-nu na-²tu-te u₂-š_a₂-aš-bi-su-nu.
 (iii 132) URU kal-²hu ... (133) UN.MEŠ ki-šit-ti š_u-ia š_a₂ KUR.KUR.MEŠ š_a₂ a-pe-lu-š²i-na-ni š_a₂ KUR su-²hi KUR la-qe-e ... (134) al-qa-a ina ŠA₃ u₂-š_a₂-aš-bit.³²¹
 (i 31) In those days, the authority of my [offices of] king and lord came forth by the command of the great gods. I am king. I am lord. ... (40) When Aššur ... (42) commanded me to subdue and to administer the lands, the mountains, and the highlands, ... (45) I mustered my chariots and troops. ... (46) I marched to the land of Tumme and conquered the city. ... (48) I massacred many, I carried off captives and livestock. ... (53) Their cities (54) I turned over, demolished, and burned by fire. ... (57) The radiance of Aššur my lord overwhelmed them. ... (66) The troops that had fled from my weapons, came down, and submitted to me. (67) I imposed seizure, payments, and labor upon them. ... (74) I received the tribute and payments of the land. ... (80) Fear of the radiance of Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed them. The nobles and the elders of the city in order to save their lives came out in front of me (81) and grasped my feet [submitted]. (99) By the command of Aššur, ... the governor of the land of Su²hi ... brought his payments to Nineveh before*

³²¹ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 2), 195–223.

me. ... (105) I made a statue of my royal office and set it up in their midst. ... (107) With my troops and my battle [skill], I besieged and conquered the city. I killed with the sword 800 of the soldiers. (108) I burned 3000 captives from among them. I did not leave one of them alive as a hostage. ... (114) The people trusted their strong walls and their large number of soldiers and did not come down to me. (115) They did not grasp my feet; in strife and conflict, I besieged and conquered the city.

(ii 9) The rest of the inhabitants of the land of Nirbu, who had fled from my weapons, (10) came down and grasped my feet. I resettled them in their abandoned cities and houses.

(iii 133) I took people from the lands that I had conquered ... I settled them in the midst of ... (132) Kalḫu.

This long inscription of Aššurnāṣirpal II says much about the ideology of the Neo-Assyrian empire. The command of the great gods establishes the king's supreme authority. The text focuses on the actions and authority of Aššur alone and the direct command of the god Aššur to set out on a campaign of conquest. The king massacres great numbers of people and collects "captives and livestock." Troops that fled before the "radiance of Aššur" could return and submit, and then the king could either kill them or include them in his own forces. Submissive inhabitants of cities and lands had to pay "seizure, payments, and labor" to the king. At least in one case, Aššurnāṣirpal II did "not leave one of them alive as a hostage." The king could take people and livestock from the lands and resettle them in the capital cities or anywhere in Assyria. The annals record the king's obedience to ^dAššur (dingir; determinative for a divine name).

The relationship between the god Aššur and the king Aššurnāṣirpal II in this latter part of the inscription thus appears to consist of a more precise imperial program for conquest and the king's obligation to fulfill it by means of the authority vested in his office and his authority to command the army on a campaign of conquest. The role of the great gods and the other named gods, who appear to support the king's authority, pales in comparison to the overwhelming power of the god Aššur. The extent of the campaign and the number of cities conquered in this long inscription indicate that the god Aššur represented not just a source of authority but a source of military authority under the command to achieve international conquest and the imperial projection of power. Aššurnāṣirpal II appears to have envisioned a new universal world order controlled by the commands of the god Aššur and the military might of the army to enforce them.

According to the text, Aššurnāṣirpal II had both the authority of the god Aššur to conquer and to plunder and the army and the ability to perform these duties. The king's obedience and service to the god provide the king with his ability both to conquer and to instill the "fear of the radiance of

Aššur, my lord,” in the hearts of kings, soldiers, and citizens in the cities that they encounter. The exploits of the king make clear the consequences of not submitting to the demands of the authority of the king and the god, whereas submissive people in this case received resettlement in the city of Kalḫu and its environs. People who trusted in their walls and their soldiers met massacre and destruction. The inscriptional rhetoric often matched the actual policy of the empire. The annals of the campaigns of Aššurnāṣirpal II describe the calculated destruction and terror and “enumerate those massacred, impaled, burnt, and taken captive.”³²²

The text leaves no room for the disobedient. Within such an ideological system, underlings and enemies have no choice but to obey the commands of authority or face death by sword or fire. In this context the phrase, *pul₂-ḫi me-lam-me ša₂ aš-šur EN-ia*, (terror of the radiance of Aššur my lord) appears to refer to the Assyrian army, the sight of which would overwhelm them (*is-ḫup-šu₂-nu*). The army appears to constitute the de facto source of power. It provides the means to conquer cities and lands and to enforce the commands and decisions of the god and the king. As the text describes the ideology, the command comes from the god, and the king enforces it by means of the overwhelming power of the army at his disposal. The whole system links together by obedience to the will of the god Aššur, who commands the king and the army to project his power into the peripheral regions of the four quarters.

Evidence of mass deportations,³²³ enforced labor and urbanization,³²⁴ warfare and conquest,³²⁵ political and economic domination sustained by fortress colonies like that in Aribua,³²⁶ and collection of *maddattu*³²⁷ indicate that Aššurnāṣirpal II enforced, and thus made law, his ideology and policy under the universal jurisdiction and authority of Aššur.

5.3. Šalmaneser III (858–823 B.C.E.)

Šalmaneser III received the same commission that Aššurnāṣirpal II had received and carried out his commission “to subdue all the lands,” as the following passage indicates:

(11) *e-nu-ma aš-šur EN GAL-u₂ ina ku-un šA₃-šu₂ ina IGI.II.MEŠ-šu₂*
KU₃.MEŠ ud-da-ni-ma ana SIPA-ut KUR aš-šur ib-ba-an-ni (12)
GIŠ.TUKUL dan-nu mu-šam-qit la ma-gi-ri u₂-šat-me-ḫa-ni-ma a-ga-

³²² Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 36.

³²³ Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 2–4; Machinist, “Assyrians,” 89.

³²⁴ Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 37–40.

³²⁵ Eph'al, “On Warfare,” 88.

³²⁶ Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 36–37.

³²⁷ Bär, *Assyrische Tribut*, 7.

a MAḤ *up-pi-ra* EN-*ti* (13) *nap-ḥur* KUR.KUR.MEŠ *la-a ma-gi-ru-ut*
aš-šur ana pe-li u šuk-nu-še ag-giš u₂-ma-³²⁸e-ra-an-ni.

(11) When Aššur, the great lord, in the loyalty of his heart and with his pure eyes, chose me, and for the office of shepherd of the land of Aššur named me, (12) he appointed to me the strong weapon, which kills the disobedient, and he crowned me with a great crown. (13) He furiously commanded me to subdue all the lands not submissive to Aššur and to exercise dominion.³²⁹

The language of the commission reflects that of the commissioning of Aššurnāširpal II, where Aššur and Ninurta called the name of Aššurnāširpal and gave him the merciless weapon with the support of the gods Aššur and Šamaš. Here Aššur alone chooses Šalmaneser III for the office of shepherd of the god's land and appoints to him the strong weapon to kill those not submissive to Aššur.

The appointment and statement of purpose play an official public role to state the business and the duty of Šalmaneser III in the office of the king. The text records and relays this information, and thus the authors of the text, the *ummiānū*, play the role here of official purveyors of official state business and law. This proclamation then may function as more than just a statement of ideology because it describes and announces the foundational law of the land that comes from the highest authority in the land and which they put into practice. The strong weapon (GIŠ.TUKUL *dan-nu*) of the king compels individuals and officials to obey the commands of the god and the demands of the society whether by written or oral command of its highest authority.

The ensuing text would then constitute Šalmaneser III's official public record of his compliance with the commands of the god as the law of the land and his service to the state, as follows:

(15) GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ ERIN₂.ḪI.A.MEŠ *ad-ki* ... URU ... *ak-ta-šad* ...
 (17) *ina* IZI GIBIL₂-*up* ... *ma-da-tu* ... (19) *am-ḥur* ... (27) *pu-ul-ḫi*
me-lam-me ša₂ *aš-šur* EN-*ia is-ḫu-pu* ... GIR3.II-*ia iṣ-bu-ti* ... GIŠ
ni-ri UGU-šu₂-*nu aš₂-kun* ... (31) URU *a-si-bi ak-ta-šad* GAZ.MEŠ-
 šu₂ ḪI.A.MEŠ *a-duk šal-la-su aš₂-lu-la* ... (35) *ša-lam bu-na-ni-ia* ...
 DU₃-*uṣ* (36) *ta-na-ti aš-šur* ... *aš₂-ṭur* ... (40) *a-na* A.BA.BA ša₂ KUR
a-mur-ri aṣ-bat ar-ḫu ... (56) *a-na re-ṣu-te a-ḫa-miṣ it-tak₃-lu-ma*
ik-ṣu-ru ME₃ *a-na e-peš tuq-ma-ti* (57) *a-na* GABA-*ia it-bu-ni ina*
 A₂.MEŠ MAḤ.MEŠ-*te* ša₂ ^dURI₃.GAL *a-lik IGI-ia ina* GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ
ez-zu-ter (58) ša₂ ^d*aš-šur* EN *iṣ-ru-ka it-ti-šu₂-nu am-da-ḫi-iṣ a-bi-*
ik-ta-šu₂-nu aš₂-kun ... (65) ID₃ *a-ra-an-tu e-ti-bir* ... (69) *ina qi₂-*

³²⁸ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 3), 7–8. Šalmaneser III, A.0.102.1.

³²⁹ My translation follows that of Grayson.

bit ^d*aš-šur* EN-ia, (70) UKKIN-*šu₂-nu* *u₂-par₂-ri-ir* ... URU *a-si-bi*,
ak-ta-šad, *šallassunu* DUGUD-tu.³³⁰

(15) I mustered chariots and troops ... I captured the city ... (17) I burned (it) ... Tribute ... (19) I received ... (27) The fear of the radiance of Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed them. ... They submitted ... I imposed my yoke on them. (31) I besieged the city, captured it, massacred many, carried off plunder ... (35) I made an image of myself ... (36) I wrote praises of Aššur ... (40) I took the path to the sea of the land of Amurru ... (56) They trusted in each other and prepared for battle. (57) Against me they attacked. With the great power of the divine standard, I proceeded forward. With the fierce weapons that Aššur presented, I fought and set defeat on them ... (65) I crossed the Orontes River ... (69) By the command of Aššur, my lord, (70) I scattered their forces ... I besieged the city, captured it, and carried off heavy plunder.

In the voice of Šalmaneser III, the text tells the same story that Aššurnāširpal II's text told. Certain consistent phrases stand out. The king's official military endeavors begin by the command of Aššur. The king musters his chariots and troops and "besieges, captures, burns, massacres, and carries off plunder." The people of the lands experience the "fear of the radiance of Aššur" and submit. They pay tribute and tax. The king conquers many such cities and lands and in some cases, when a town "trusts in its own walls and soldiers" leaves no survivors. The king could resettle submissive populations in the land of Aššur and conscript compliant soldiers into his army although Šalmaneser III makes no explicit public claim, as Aššurnāširpal II did, to have resettled people in the land of Aššur. Not much changes between Aššurnāširpal II and Šalmaneser III, but in this part of the inscription Šalmaneser III appears to place the same emphasis on conquering and plundering that Aššurnāširpal II did.

A separate inscription of Šalmaneser III depicts his brutality and his conquest of the land on the coast of the upper sea (Mediterranean). Šalmaneser III had intensified the contact with the land of Ḫatti (Syria, Phoenicia, and Canaan)³³¹ and fought at Qarqar with an anti-Assyrian coalition of those states, which included Ahab of the kingdom of Bīt Ḫumri (House of Omri) in 853 B.C.E.³³² This inscription begins with a dedication to the god Aššur and ends with a description of Šalmaneser III's conquest of Qarqar, as follows:

³³⁰ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 3), 8–10. Šalmaneser III, A.0.102.1.

³³¹ Sennacherib too refers to Canaan and Phoenicia as the land of Ḫattû: "In my third campaign I went to the land of Ḫattu. Luli, king of Sidon ... Great Sidon, Little Sidon, Bit-Zitti, Sarpitu, ... Akzib, Acco," Gallagher, *Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah*, 93.

³³² Na'aman, *Ancient Israel's History*, 198.

(i 1) ^d*aš-šur* EN GAL-*u*₂ MAN *gim-rat* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ ... (5) ^{md}*šul₃-ma-nu-MAŠ* MAN *kiš-šat* UN.MEŠ ... (12) *ša₂ kul-lat za-i-ri-šu i-ne₂-ru-ma is-pu-nu a-bu-ba-iš* ... (22) *pul₂-ḫi me-lam-me* (23) *ša₂ aš-šur* EN-*ia is-ḫu-pu-šu-nu-ti ur-du-ni* GIR₃.IL.MEŠ *iš-ba-tu* GUN *u ma-da-tu* UGU-*šu₂-nu u₂-kin* ... (26) GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-*ia in tam-di u₂-lil* ... ii (26) *ma-da-tu ina ugu-šu₂ aš₂-kun mu-šam₃-ma am-da-ḫar* ... (89) *a-na URU qar-qa-ra aq-ṭi₂-rib* ... (90) MAN-*ti-šu₂ ap-pul₂ aq-qur ina IZI.MEŠ aš₂-ru-up* ... (91) 2 LIM GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ 10 LIM ERIN₂.MEŠ *ša₂ ^ma-ḫa-ab-bu* (92) KUR *sir-ʿa-la-a-a* ... (97) TA URU *qar-qa-ra a-di URU gil₂-ṭi₂-rib* BAD₅.BAD₅-*šu₂-nu lu aš₂-kun*.³³³

(1) Aššur, great god, king of all the great gods ... (5) Šalmaneser [III] king of all the peoples ... (12) killed all his enemies and annihilated them like a flood ... (22) The fear of the terrifying radiance (23) of Aššur overwhelmed them, and they submitted. I imposed tribute and tax on them ... (26) I washed my weapons in the sea ... ii (26) I imposed tribute on them and received it annually. ... (89) I approached his royal city of Qarqara. (90) I razed, destroyed, and burned it. ... (91) 2000 chariots and 10,000 troops of Aḫabbu (92) of the land of Sirʿalayya ... (97) From the city of Qarqar, I defeated them.

The text emphasizes Šalmaneser III's fulfillment of his duty to conquer, to oppose, and to impose tribute on the enemies of Aššur. For the first time, here occurs an explicit mention of an annual tribute paid to Aššur. The emphasis on conquest, plunder, and tribute in the annals suggests that by doing so Šalmaneser III served the command of the god Aššur. Throughout the lengthy annals, the king repeats over and over, from city to city, his conquests and plunder gathered for the land of Aššur. The other gods benefit from this enrichment but do not command it. The text stresses the king's obedience to the command of Aššur as the primary concern of the inscription: "I razed, destroyed, and burned it." At this point in history, the text does not record excuses, such as punishment or disobedience, for conquest. The command of the god Aššur suffices to justify the aggressive military operations of the king.

The following text, which appears within the previous segment, describes in more detail Šalmaneser III's conquest, treatment, and renaming of Til-Barsip and other cities, which lay on the trade route along the eastern bank of the Euphrates River 100 km northeast of modern Aleppo, Syria. Šalmaneser III renamed one of his new royal cities URU *qi-bi-it-aššur* (city of the Command of Aššur), and this inscription illustrates the practice of making pe-

³³³ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 3), 11–24. Šalmaneser III, A.0.102.2.

ripheral cities Assyrian by removing the indigenous population and replacing them with Assyrians (LU₂.MEŠ-e LU₂ aš₂-šu-ra-a-a), as follows:³³⁴

(30) *ina li-me* ^maš-šur-EN-ka-in *ina* ITI.G[U₄]UD 13.KAM₂ TA URU.NINA *at-tu-muš* (31) ID₂.ḪAL.ḪAL *e-te-bir* KUR ḫa-sa-mu KUR di-iḫ-nu-nu *at-ta-bal-kat₃* a-na URU.DU₆-bar-si-ip URU dan-nu-ti-š_{u2} ša₂ ^ma-hu-ni DUMU a-di-ni <aq-ṭi₂-rib> ak-ta-šad ^ma-ḫu-ni (32) DUMU a-di-ni TA IGI na-mur-rat GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-ia ez-zu-te u ME₃-ia šit-mu-ri a-na šu-zu-ub ZI.MEŠ-š_{u2} [ina mēlī]-ša₂ ID₂.A.RAD *e-bir* (33) a-na KUR.KUR.MEŠ ša₂-ni-a-ti ib-bal-kit *ina* qī₂-bit aš-šur EN GAL <EN>-ia URU.DU₆-bar-si-ip URU a-li-gu URU [na-pi-gu UR]U ru-gu-li-tu₂ a-na URU MAN-ia (34) aš-bat LU₂.MEŠ-e LU₂ aš₂-šu-ra-a-a *ina* lib-bi u₂-še-šib E₂.GAL.MEŠ-te a-na šu-bat MAN-ia *ina* qe₂-reb-š_{u2} ad-di [MU] URU.DU₆-bar-si-ip URU kar-^dšul₃-ma-nu-MAŠ (35) MU URU nap-pi-gi URU li-ta-aš-šur MU URU al-li-gi URU aš-bat-lā-ku-nu MU URU ru-gu-li-ti URU qī-bi-it-[aššur] MU-š_{u2}-nu ab-bi ... (39) ki-i *ina* URU kar-^dšul₃-ma-nu-MAŠ us-ba-ku-ni ma-da-tu₂ ša₂ MAN.MEŠ-ni ša₂ a-ḫat tam-di u₃ MAN.MEŠ-ni ša₂ a-ḫat ID₂.A.RAD KU₃.BABBAR KU₃.GI AN.NA.MEŠ ZABAR (40) UTUL₂.MEŠ ZABAR.MEŠ AN.BAR.MEŠ GU₄.MEŠ UDU.MEŠ TUG₂ lu-bul₂-ti bir-me u TUG₂.GADA.MEŠ am-ḫur TA URU kar-^dšul₃-ma-nu-MAŠ at-tu-muš.

(30) In the eponymy of Aššur-bēla-ka, on the thirteenth day of the month of Iyyar, I departed from Nineveh, crossed over the Tigris river, and crossed Mount Ḫasamu and Mount Diḫnunu. (31) I have <approached> conquered Til-Barsip, the fortified city of Ahuni, son of Adini. Ahuni, (32) son of Adini, upon seeing the terror-inspiring radiance of my furious weapons and my wild combat, in order to save his life, crossed over the river Euphrates; (33) to other lands he crossed. At the command of Aššur, the great lord, my lord, the city of Til-Barsip, the city of Aligu, the city of Nappigu, the city of Rugulitu, I seized for my royal cities. (34) I settled Assyrian men therein. I established palaces for my royal residence in its midst. The name of the city of Til-Barsip, the city of Kār-^dšulmanu-ašared [Port of Šalmaneser]; (35) the name of the city of Napigu, city of Līta-Aššur [Power-of-Aššur]; the name of the city of Alligu, the city of Ašbat-lā-kunu [I Seize the Unfirm], the name of the city of Rugulitu, the city of Qībit-Aššur [Command of Aššur]—their names, I name. ... (39) While in the city of Kār-^dšulmanu-ašared, they brought to me the tribute of the kings of the shore of the sea and the kings of the bank of the river Euphrates. I received silver, gold, lead, bronze, (40)

³³⁴ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers* (RIMA 3), 19. Šalmaneser III, A.0.102.2.31–40. Genge, *Stelen neuassyrischer Könige*, 92–93, 239–40.

bowls of bronze and iron, cattle, ovicaprids, and multicolored clothing and linens. From the city of Kār-^dšulmanu-ašared I departed.

Šalmaneser III thus plundered and rebuilt conquered cities in an Assyrian image and took tribute in the form of the iron and silver of Aram.³³⁵ He overwhelmed the smaller Aramaean cities with the following strategies of warfare: open field battle, siege, assault on cities and breach of walls, raids, and campaigns.³³⁶ He took 110,610 captives from there to forced labor (*ardutu*) in Kalḫu.³³⁷ Later on he sent his generals on campaigns but claimed their military successes as his own.³³⁸ Šalmaneser III enforced his policies with the power of the army, as he calls it: “the terror-inspiring radiance of my furious weapons and my wild combat.”

5.6. Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 B.C.E.)

In the Kalḫu Annals (text 5), Tiglath-pileser III outlines his imperial policy in the description of the rebuilding of Ḫumut, as follows:

(1) *i-na* UGU DU₆ *kamri* (2) [*ša* URU-*ḫu-mut i*]-*qab-bu-šu-ni* URU DU₃-*uš* ... (3) URU.*kar-aš-šur* MU-*šu ab-bi* GIŠ.TUKUL *aš-šur* EN-*ia i-na lib-bi ar-me* UN.[MEŠ KUR.KUR] *ki-šit-ti* ŠU.II-*ia i-na lib-bi u₂-še-šib* (4) [GUN *ma-da-tu u₂*]-*kin-šu-nu-ti it-ti* UN.MEŠ KUR *aš-šur am-nu-šu₂-nu-ti*. ... (8) *a-bel₂ ana mi-[šir]* KUR *aš-šur GUR-ra* LU₂.*šu-ut* SAG-*ia* LU₂.[EN.NAM UGU-*šu-nu*] *aš-kun*. ... (11–12) *pa-a 1-en u₂-ša₂-aš₂-kin-šu-nu-ti it-ti* UN.MEŠ [KUR *aš-šur am-nu-šu₂-nu-ti* GIŠ].*ni-ri aš-šur* EN-*ia ki-i* *ša₂ aš-šu-ri* [*e-mid-su-nu-ti*]. (12) ... *da-ad₂-me na-du-u₂-ti* *ša pi-rik* KUR-*ia* *ša* [*ina tar-ši* LUGAL.MEŠ-*ni* AD].MEŠ-*ia ar-bu-tu il-[li-ku]* [Annal 10, text 6] (1) *a-na eš-šu-te ak-šer-ma*.³³⁹

(1) On top of a mound of rubble (2) called Ḫumut, I built a city. ... (3) I named it Kār-Aššur. I set up in its midst the weapon of Aššur, my lord. I settled in its midst people from lands conquered by my hand. (4) I imposed upon them tribute and tax and counted them with the inhabitants of the land of Aššur. ... (8) I ruled. I took them captive to the land of Aššur. I placed my commander over them as governor. ... (11–12) As one I settled them, and with people of the land of Aššur I counted them. I imposed upon them the yoke of

³³⁵ Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 37–38.

³³⁶ Eph'al, “On Warfare, 88, 91–95.

³³⁷ Tadmor, “Treaty and Oath,” 150; Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 37–40.

³³⁸ Bär, *Assyrische Tribut*, 11.

³³⁹ Tadmor and Yamada, *Royal Inscriptions*, 26–28.

Aššur, my lord, as upon the people of Aššur. (12) ... The abandoned settlements on the frontier of my land, which had gone to ruin during the reign of my royal ancestors, the kings of the land of Aššur, [Annal 10, text 6] (1) I restored.

After conquering and demolishing a city and removing its population, Tiglath-pileser III resettled it with a new population and turned it into an Assyrian city with an Assyrian name. Unlike his predecessors, who had left conquered cities destroyed and abandoned, Tiglath-pileser III adopted a new policy to restore and to repopulate them with new Assyrians. The term “Assyrian,” as used in this context and perhaps throughout the imperial inscriptions, designates a political relationship of a people that submitted to the yoke of Aššur and swore the oath of obedience to the god and the king.³⁴⁰

Tiglath-pileser III set in motion the deportation system that formed one of the foundations of the Assyrian empire. The phrase *it-ti UN.MEŠ KUR aš-šur am-nu-šu₂-nu-ti* (with the people of the land of Aššur I counted them) entails the annihilation and assimilation of local cultures. It recurs in the imperial inscriptions until the time of Sennacherib. The greatest number of mass deportations took place during the reigns of Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon II, and Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Ashurbanipal. The documents record 124 cases of mass deportation, which amount to an estimated total of four and a half million people over a period of about three centuries.³⁴¹

Although Aššurnāṣirpal II (883–859 B.C.E.) and Šalmaneser III (858–824 B.C.E.) had created empires, Tiglath-pileser III put the imperial policies into effect on a large scale and created the great empire of KUR *aš-šur*. Emperor Tiglath-pileser III kept up a constant interior colonization by moving populations around the empire into border areas in order to break up the national cohesion of the groups and to plant loyal Assyrians in the midst of the foreign populations.³⁴²

Tiglath-pileser III introduced “systematic economic, cultural, and ethnic integration,” according to Parpola, and transformed the independent client states into provinces run by Assyrian appointees under direct control of the Assyrian government. He destroyed the urban center, deported the population, reconstructed the capital in Assyrian style, installed an Assyrian governor and garrisons, and imposed uniform taxation, conscription, and imperial standards and measures; the inhabitants of the new province became Assyrian citizens, and the economy served Assyrian interests. The so-called vassal treaties legitimized the process of annexation of a country in the event of violation of the treaty, and the onerous stipulations of the treaties forced

³⁴⁰ Machinist, “Assyrians on Assyria,” 89.

³⁴¹ Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 2–23.

³⁴² Malbran-Labat, *L’armée*, 7–11.

rebellion, which resulted in destruction, deportation, and annexation.³⁴³ The provincial system, according to Postgate, concentrated wealth and power in the provincial capital and the military elite, which in turn caused a decline in the power and influence of the older towns and the former landed elite of the Assyrian homeland.³⁴⁴

Kalḫu Annal 9 (text 5) of Tiglath-pileser III documents the new Assyrian imperial policy of annexation and thus introduces new topics and phrases. It presupposes a conquest and begins, as mentioned above, with the reconstruction of a destroyed city. The text describes Tiglath-pileser III's policy of setting up of the weapon of Aššur (GIŠ TUKUL *aš-šur*) in a new province and his inclusion of the resettled people from other conquered areas as people of the land of Aššur (*it-ti UN.MEŠ KUR aš-šur*). The inscription attests at the same time to the expansion of Tiglath-pileser III's policy of annexation as Tiglath-pileser III apportioned thousands of deportees to conquered cities destined to become the provinces of palace courtiers and administrators: "I settled in its midst people from lands conquered by my hand" (*i-na lib-bi ar-me UN.[MEŠ KUR.KUR] ki-šit-ti ŠU.II-ia i-na lib-bi u₂-še-šib*). Such deported people became "like Assyrians," according to Oded, as Tiglath-pileser III "imposed on them the yoke of Aššur my lord as like Assyrians" (GIŠ].*ni-ri aš-šur EN-ia ki-i ša₂ aš-šu-ri [e-mid-su-nu-ti]*).³⁴⁵ In the voice of Tiglath-pileser III, "the abandoned settlements on the frontier of my land (*da-ad₂-me na-du-u₂-ti ša pi-rik KUR-ia*), which had gone to ruin during the reign of my royal ancestors, I restored." Tiglath-pileser III transformed them into productive lands in the service of the army of the god Aššur. The Assyrian frontier zone thus, according to Parker, comprised a broad transitional zone between the empire and the countries beyond the frontier.³⁴⁶ The Assyrians maintained their stranglehold on conquered cities and provinces, according to Malbran-Labat, by deporting the existing population and then reconstructing the cities as fortresses and agricultural settlements with Assyrian names and populating them with submissive soldiers and agricultural deportees from elsewhere.³⁴⁷

The weapon of Aššur (GIŠ.TUKUL *aš-šur*) in this inscription may refer to a garrison established under a royal symbol, such as a sword, left within a destroyed city to administer its reconstruction in the image of an Assyrian city. The term weapon of Aššur might also have referred to the battle standard, which the Assyrians took on their campaigns.³⁴⁸

The sentence, "I placed upon them the yoke of Aššur my lord as upon the Assyrians," (GIŠ].*ni-ri aš-šur EN-ia ki-i ša₂ aš-šu-ri [e-mid-su-nu-ti]*) attests

³⁴³ Parpola, "Assyria's Expansion," 99–111.

³⁴⁴ Postgate, "Economic Structure," 216.

³⁴⁵ Oded, *War*, 14.

³⁴⁶ Parker, *Mechanics of Empire*, 264.

³⁴⁷ Malbran-Labat, *L'armée*, 13.

³⁴⁸ Gallagher, *Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah*, 95.

to Tiglath-pileser III's imperial policy of annexation that went beyond the concept of a mutual treaty or a contract with a subject. The treaty provided the legal justification for the inevitable annexation of a territory, the destruction of noncompliant populations, and the deportation and ultimate Assyrianization of compliant populations. A resistant population met with violent punishment from the weapon of Aššur, and a compliant population underwent inevitable deportation to another territory nonetheless. Most deportees went into the agricultural colonies, according to Parker, which the Assyrians founded as new rural villages along the frontiers of the expanding empire in order to supply the expanding army.³⁴⁹

The phrase, “the yoke of Aššur my lord” (GIŠ].*ni-ri aš-šur EN-ia*) also attests to the fact that Tiglath-pileser III referred to the god Aššur as “my lord” (EN-*ia*) as the source of the emperor's authority and military power. The emperors of Assyria did not rule as despotic tyrants with power focused on the cult of their persons. They served the interests of the god Aššur under the same yoke of obedience and service as the lowest deported slave of the empire, who worked to feed the troops. Citizens of the empire served the same god and country under the same yoke. The monumental inscriptions of the emperors serve the contemporaneous purpose of attesting to their compliance to the command and the yoke of Aššur to expand the boundaries and power of the god's universal power over the chaos of the four quarters.

Summary Inscription 9 (Text 49: Reverse) of Tiglath-pileser III describes part of the campaign to the land of Ḫatti, which included the annexation of Israel, as follows:

- (1) [... URU.š*i-mir-ra* URU.ar-qa-a] (2) [*a-na*] *mi-šir* KUR aš-šur.KI *u₂-ter-ra* [2 LU₂.š*u-ut* SAG-ia LU₂.EN.NAM.MEŠ UGU-š*u₂-nu aš₂-kun*] (3) [KUR.E₂] *ḥa-za-ʾi-i-li rap-š*u₂* a-na si-ḥir-ti-š*u₂* TA KUR.[lab-na-na a-di lib₃-bi URU.ga-al-ʾa-a-di URU.a-bi-il-š*iṭ-ṭi*] (4) [*ša pat*]-ti KUR.E₂-*ḥu-um-ri-a a-na mi-šir* KUR aš-šur.KI [*u₂-ter-ra* LU₂.š*u₂-ut* SAG-ia LU₂.EN.NAM UGU-š*u₂-nu aš₂-kun*] (5) [*ḥi*]-ri-mu KUR.šur-ra-a-a *ša it-ti* *ra-ḥi-a-ni iš-ku-na* [*pi-i-š*u₂* ...*] (6) [URU].*ma-ḥa-la-ab* URU *dan-nu-ti-š*u₂* a-di* URU.MEŠ-ni GAL.MEŠ *ak-šud*. ... (9) [KUR.E₂-*ḥu-um-ri*]-a a-na *gi-mir*-[*ti-š*u₂* ak-šud ... a-di mar*]-š*i-ti-š*u₂*-nu a*-[*na* KUR aš-šur.KI *u₂-ra-a*] (10) [... *a-u₂-si-ʾi a*]-na LUGAL-*u₂-ti ina* UGU-š*u₂-nu* [*aš₂-kun*]. ... (23) [... *ša*] a-na LUGAL.MEŠ-ni a-li-kut *pa-ni-ia la eš-pi-lu-ma* [*la iš-pu-ra ši-pir-š*u₂**] (24) [... *ki-š*iṭ-te** KUR.ḥat]-ti *iš-me₂-e-ma na-mur-rat aš-šur EN-ia* [*is-ḥup-š*u₂*-ma*].³⁵⁰*
- (1) The cities of Simirra and Arqa (2) I annexed to the land of Aššur. I placed over them two courtiers as governors. (3) The whole

³⁴⁹ Parker, “Garrisoning the Empire,” 84 n. 39.

³⁵⁰ Tadmor and Yamada, *Royal Inscriptions*, 131–32.

broad land of Bit-Hazael, from Mount Lebanon as far as the cities of Gilead, Abel, ... (4) on the border of Bit Ħumria, I annexed to the land of Aššur. I placed my courtier as governor over them. (5) Hiram of Tyre, who plotted with Rezin ... I captured Mahalab, his fortified city along with other large cities. (9) The entire land of Bit-Ħumria I captured. ... With their belongings, I carried them off to the land of Aššur. (10) I placed Ausi'i in the office of king over them. ... (23) He who had not submitted, or sent his messenger, to the kings going before me (24) ... heard about the conquest of the land of Ħatti, and the terrifying radiance of Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed him.

If Bit-Ħumria refers to Israel, and Ausi'i refers to Hoshea, then the account in this inscription more or less corresponds to that of the DH (2 Kgs 17:5–6, 24) when the *melek ʾaššûr* (king of Aššur) invaded Samaria, deported the population, and replaced it with deportees from Mesopotamia. According to the Akkadian account, however, Hoshea would have come from the Assyrian court. The inscription describes the smooth operation of Tiglath-pileser III's policy of annexation ([*a-na*] *mi-šir* KUR *aš-šur*.KI *u₂-ter-ra*). This inscription does not describe much violence, and the people of the coalition appear to have submitted to Tiglath-pileser III without resistance. The reporting of conquests, however, according to Holloway, took for granted the violence, psychological terror, capture of cult images, mass deportations, repopulation, and rebuilding of conquered areas.³⁵¹

The same Summary Inscription 9 of Tiglath-pileser III does not begin or end with a dedication to Aššur or to another god. It serves nonetheless as a proclamation of justification for the king. Such public displays, inscriptions, and declarations of victory and successful campaigns fulfilled the king's duty to the god Aššur. The inscription carries on the tradition of Assyrian kings to record their legal compliance with the command of the god Aššur to expand the land. It records Tiglath-pileser III's primary tactic of warfare to use the "terrifying radiance of Aššur" to capture cities and thus to instill fear in rulers, such as "He who had not submitted, or sent his messenger, to the kings going before me," (*ša*] *a-na* LUGAL.MEŠ-*ni a-li-kut pa-ni-ia la eš-pi-lu-ma* [*la iš-pu-ra ši-pir-šu₂*), who might then submit and accept annexation and deportation without a fight. The text does not report the reciprocal deportations from the other extremities of the empire to replace the missing populations, but the military and political terror, coercion, and conformity lay "largely unreported" in the background of the propagandistic imperial inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrians, as Holloway noted.³⁵²

³⁵¹ Holloway, *Aššur is King!*, xv, xvii, 67, 73, 80, 98, 166, 174, 178, 217, 224, 369, 370.

³⁵² *Ibid.*, xvi.

The phrase “I annexed to the land of Aššur” attests not only to Tiglath-pileser III’s policy of annexation but also perhaps to a subtle change in the relationship between the king and the god Aššur. Tiglath-pileser III appears to extend his relationship of total reverence and obedience to the god Aššur to the empire and even beyond by targeting neighbors and enemies not just for plunder and tribute but for permanent annexation and transformation into Assyrians. Annexation of territories as provinces, according to Oded, involved the liquidation of local political bodies and national groups by deportation and the setting up of a permanent imperial administrative organization in the occupied areas.³⁵³ This topic, however, has inspired some differing opinions: Mayer suggests that not until the Sargonid period does a world domination ideology of Aššur appear and that from a circle of priests associated with Sennacherib.³⁵⁴ Chamaza finds that elements of the theology of world domination by Aššur emerged in the Middle Assyrian period of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244–1208 B.C.E.).³⁵⁵ Parpola finds that the ritual surrounding the life of the king reflected the need to maintain the divine world order from the earliest periods.³⁵⁶ Weippert notes that the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions did not aspire to world domination until the reign of Tiglath-pileser III and the development of the *Reichsgott Aššur*.³⁵⁷

Tiglath-pileser III’s increased focus on imperial hegemony—through conquest, destruction, political subjugation, deportation, annexation of land, rebuilding of military provinces, and Assyrianization of populations in service of the imperial god Aššur—may indicate that Aššur’s role in the empire, vis-à-vis the other, domestic gods, had become more important if not defining. Through the implementation of his policies of annexation, which resulted in the ultimate destruction of disobedient peoples, he projected, with overwhelming military power, a political imperial model of unitary and universal jurisdiction to transform the four corners of the world. Tiglath-pileser III thus enforced the imperial ideology and theology as the practical law of the empire by means of the terrifying radiance of Aššur.

Tiglath-pileser III’s Iran Stele (text 35) refers to the god Aššur as the supreme god and to the king as the high priest of the god Aššur, as follows:

- (1) [*aš-šur* EN GAL ^dEN.LIL₂.LA₂ DINGIR.MEŠ *mu-ši-me* NAM.MEŠ ...
 (3) [...] *mu-u₂-kin iš-di* KUR (4) [^dAG *ta-mi-iḫ*] GI.DUB *na-ši* DUB *ši-mat* DINGIR.DINGIR (5) [...] ^dU.GUR [...] (21) [^mTUKUL-*ti-A-E₂-šar₂*]-*ra* GAR ^dBAD NUN SANGA *aš-šur*. ... (26) [...] MAN *kiš*]-*ša₂-ti* MAN KUR *aš-šur*.KI MAN KUR *šu-miri* ... (29) [*mu-rap-piš*] *mi-šit* KUR *aš-*

³⁵³ Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 43.

³⁵⁴ Mayer, *Politik*, 65.

³⁵⁵ Chamaza, *Die Omnipotenz Aššurs*, 13.

³⁵⁶ Parpola, “Sons of God,” 27.

³⁵⁷ Weippert, “Heiliger Krieg,” 487.

šur (30) [*ma-ḥir* GUN *u* IGI].SA₂-e ša₂ DU₃-ši-na ad-na-ti (31) [... *a*]-
na ru-pu-ši UN.MEŠ-ša₂ DAGAL.MEŠ (32) [... *a*]-bur-riš a-na re-ʿe-e
(33) [iš-ku]-un-šu₂ (34) [...] aš-šur ^dEN.LIL₂.LA₂ (35) [DINGIR.MEŠ
...]-du-u a-na šum-qut la ma-giri ... (37) [...] ERIM.ḪI.A-at KUR aš-
šur.KI [...] (38) lu ad-ke.³⁵⁸

(1) Aššur, great lord, Enlil of the gods, who decides fates; ... (3) who establishes the foundation of the land; (4) Nabû, who holds the stylus, who carries the tablet of decrees of the gods; (5) Nergal, [etc. ...].

(21) Tiglath-pileser, governor of Enlil, prince, priest of Aššur. ...

(26) king of the four quarters, king of the land of Aššur, king of the land of Sumiri, ... (29) he who extends the territory of the land of Aššur, (30) he who receives tribute and gifts of all the world, (31) for the expanding of his wide peoples (32) in order to shepherd them in pastures, (33–34) Aššur, the god Enlil, placed him (35) to strike down the unsubmissive. ... (37) I called up the vast armies of the land of Aššur.

This inscription emphasizes the central importance of the military imperial god Aššur, who decides fates (*mu-ši-me* NAM.MEŠ) and around whom Tiglath-pileser III could arrange his centralized imperial military administration. The text might have placed Nabû after Aššur/Enlil in the inscription in order to emphasize the importance of the god of the scholars, since they controlled the flow of information in the empire. In emphasizing the titles *šakin* ^dBE (= ^dBAD = Enlil) and SANGA *aš-šur* for the king, the scribes created a sort of parallel mythical structure between the top gods—Aššur/Enlil, Nabû, etc.—and the top human hierarchy in which Tiglath-pileser III serves as “governor of Enlil” and “priest of Aššur.” Within the configuration of this tablet, Nabû, the god of the *ummiānū* scholars, would thus hold a preeminent place in the hierarchy over the remaining gods. Such a prominent reference to Nabû, the god of the scribes, might have represented an insider code for the *ummiānū* themselves. This stele may reflect the hierarchy of the empire: the omnipotent god Aššur decides fates, and records them with the stylus of Nabû, and determines the fate of the empire by sending those messages to the armies of the land of Aššur.

Tiglath-pileser III’s policy and, in effect, law of annexation resulted in the real destruction, plunder, deportation of survivors, exchange of replacement populations, restorations of cities in the image of Assyria, and the Assyrianization of an estimated 4.5 million people over his lifetime and that of his immediate successors.³⁵⁹ The policy, continued under subsequent emperors, resulted in the destruction of Israel and Judah, the deportation of their

³⁵⁸ Tadmor and Yamada, *Royal Inscriptions*, 81–83.

³⁵⁹ Liverani, “Impact,” 149.

populations, the repopulation by deportees, and their rebuilding in the Assyrian image.³⁶⁰

5.7. Sargon II (721–705 B.C.E.)

The Annals text of Sargon II records the king's interaction with Samerina and some new developments in imperial policy to deal with revolts, as the following selection illustrates:

(1) *ša* ^d*a-šur* ^dAMAR.UTU LUGAL-ut la *ša*₂-na-an *u*₂-šat-li-mu-šu-ma ... (10) *i-na* SAG LUGAL-ti-ia (11) LU₂.URU *sa-me-ri-na-a-a* ... (14) *ak-ši-id er-net-ti-ia it-ti-šu-nu am-da-ḥi-iš-ma* (15) 27 LIM 2 ME 80 UN.MEŠ *a-šib* ŠA₃-šu₂ *aš*₂-lu-la 50 GIŠ.GIGIR *ki-šir šar-ru-ti-ia i-na lib-bi-šu₂-nu ak-šur-ma* ... (16) URU *sa-mer-ri-na u₂-ter-ma* UGU *ša*₂ *pa-na u₂-še-me* UN.MEŠ KUR.KUR.MEŠ *ki-šit-ti* ŠU.II-ia *i-na lib-bi u₂-še-rib* (17) LU₂.EN.NAM UGU-šu₂-nu *aš*₂-kun-ma *bil-tu ma-da-at-tu ki-i* *ša aš*₂-šu-ri *e-mid-su-nu-ti ka-ri* ... (20) LU₂.KUR *tu-u³-mu-na-a-a ni-ir* ^d*aš-šur iṣ-lu-u₂-malu₂ na-sik-šu₂-nu i-pi-du-ma*. ... (22) UN.MEŠ *a-di mar-ši-ti-šu₂-nu as-su-ḥa-am-ma* (23) *i-na* KUR *ḥa-at-ti u₂-še-šib*. ... (54) *i-na zi-kir* ^d*aš-šur* EN-ia BAD₅.BAD₅-šu₂-nu *am-ḥaš-ma* ... (67) *i-na ḥi-iṭ-ti iḥ-tu-u₂ ul-tu aš*₂-ri-šu₂-nu *as-suḥ-šu₂-nu-ti-ma i-na* KUR *ḥa-at-ti* *ša* KUR *a-mur-re-e* (68) *u₂-še-šib-šu₂-nu-ti i-na* 4 BALA-ia ¹*ki-ak-ki* ... *a-de-e* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ *i-miṣ-ma a-na la na-še-e* GUN *ir-ša₂-a* (69) *ni-id a-ḥi a-na* DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-ia *qa-a-ti aš*₂-ši-ma URU *ši-nu-uḥ-tu* URU LUGAL-ti-šu₂ *im-ba-riš as-ḥup-ma* *ša*₂-a-šu₂ *a-di* LU₂ *mun-daḥ-še-e-šu₂* ... (70) *a-na šal-la-ti am-nu-šu₂*. ... (72) ¹*pi-si-i-ri* ... *i-na a-de-e* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ *iḥ-ti-i-ma*. ... (85a) *um-ma-na-at* ^d*aš-šur* *ga-ap-ša₂-a-ti ad-ke-e a-na ka-šad* KUR *man-na-a-a aš*₂-ta-kan *pa-ni-ia* (86) URU *i-zi-ir-tu* URU *šar-ru-ti-šu* *ša* KUR *man-na-a-a ḥu-ḥa-riš as-ḥu-up di-ik-ta-šu₂-nu ma-at-tu a-duk*. ... (164) *na-mur-rat* ^d*aš-šur* *be-li₂-ia is-ḥu-pa-šu-ma*.³⁶¹

(1) He to whom Aššur and Marduk commissioned an incomparable office of king ... (10) In the accession year of my office of king, against the people of Samerina, ... I achieved my victory. I struck them. (15) 27,289 of its inhabitants I carried away. 50 chariots I took into my royal troops (16) I converted Samerina and made it greater than before. I brought in people from the lands that I had conquered and (17) set my governor over them. I imposed tribute payments on them just like that of Assyrians. ... (20) The people of Tu'muna cast off the yoke of the god Aššur, and their ruler I imprisoned. (22) The

³⁶⁰ Stern, *Assyrian*, 3, 8–10, 19, 132; Na'aman, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors*, 200; Younger, "Repopulation of Samaria," 254.

³⁶¹ Fuchs, *Die Inschriften Sargons II*, 82–186, 313–42.

people and all their property and livestock I deported and (23) settled them in the land of Ḫatti. ... (54) By command of the god Aššur, I laid a defeat on them. (67) Because of the offense, which they committed, I tore them out of their place and settled them in the land of Ḫatti and Amurru. (68) In my fourth year of rule, Kiakki ... ignored the oath of the great gods and began to do nothing and failed to pay tribute. (69) I raised my hands to the gods, my lords, and him, his family, (70) and inhabitants, I reckoned as plunder. ... (72) Pisiri broke the oath to the great gods. ... (85) Because of the anger of the god Aššur, I mustered the army and set out to conquer the land of Mannaya. ... (86) Izirtu, his royal city, in the land of Mannaya, I overwhelmed like a bird-snare. ... The terrifying radiance of the god Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed him.

Although the DH appears to attribute the destruction of Samaria to Šalmaneser V (2 Kgs 17:3–6), this inscription attests to the conquest and resettlement of Israel by Sargon II. Excavations in Samaria suggest a demographic decline after the exile of about “28,000 people” after the conquest, according to Elat, but the archaeology does not support Sargon II’s claim that he repopulated Samaria with deportees and made it greater than before.³⁶² Of these 27,280 deportees from Samaria, according to Oded, some went into the Assyrian army, others continued their craft, and Sargon II dispersed the rest into the population of Assyria: *itti niše^{kur} Aššur amnūšunūti* (with the people of Assyria I counted them).³⁶³

The introduction of Marduk into the dedication of the inscription suggests that Sargon II had a new interest in the Babylonian god. Marduk had an ancient following in Aššur land because Tukulti-Ninurta I in 1244 B.C.E. had captured the statue and taken it to Assyria.³⁶⁴ Sargon II here assigned Marduk a more prominent place in the pantheon and wrote that he received his imperial commission from the gods Aššur and Marduk.

Sargon II presented his invasions of Samerina, Tu’muna, and Kiakki not as an imperial invasion to expand the jurisdiction of Aššur but rather as a mission to restore law and order, as he writes, “because of the offense that they committed.” This inscription may describe a policy of crisis management of rebellious states. Revolts occurred in subject countries whenever they could take advantage of the limited ability of the growing empire to act in extensive areas throughout its large empire, and as the empire grew, this problem grew with it because of the time it took for an effective force to march long distances to quell rebellions. Terms for rebellion include *nabal-kutu*, *seḫû*, *bārānû*, *bartu*.

³⁶² Elat, “Impact of Tribute,” 246–47.

³⁶³ Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 77.

³⁶⁴ Porter, *Images*, 126.

Withholding of tribute constituted rebellion and grounds for war. The phrase *ana šulmiya lā + ša'ālu* meant rebellion.³⁶⁵ Sargon II undertook his eighth campaign into Urartu in 714 B.C.E. in order to quell the rebellion, to punish the supporters, and to annex the territory.³⁶⁶ They committed offenses and ignored and broke the oaths of the great gods for which actions they required punishment. If the subjugated party broke the treaty, the king had to avenge the insulted Aššur.³⁶⁷ Broken treaties gave the Assyrians legal sanction to destroy the country and to deport the population.³⁶⁸ The rebellious behavior of subject nations stirred up “anger of the god Aššur” and provoked expensive military reprisals. Sargon II had access to the merciless weapon and the terrifying radiance of the god Aššur and did not hesitate to use it to punish offenders. The eyes and ears of the king came from his subjects and allies around the kingdom and the empire.³⁶⁹

This Annals text of Sargon II suggests a further subtle adjustment in the relationship between the god, the king, and the king's subjects. The god Aššur in this inscription shares his authority with the Babylonian god Marduk. Although Aššur had shared his position with other gods before, this prominent appearance of the Babylonian god suggests at least that Sargon II had a stronger interest in the Babylonian god, religion, and culture than his predecessors had. It may also indicate some influence from the power and cultural centers of Babylon in the Assyrian imperial court and on the educated *ummiānū*, who had great interest in Babylonian letters and art. At least in this inscription, Sargon II has a more politic nature than Tiglath-pileser III and does not hesitate to accept an ancient and venerable culture even if it rebelled and thereby offended the god Aššur.

Sargon II, like his predecessors, enacted his imperial ideology and, hence, law with overwhelming military force. He deported 50,000 people from Israel, 27,280 of them from Samerina, and brought in a replacement population of Arabs, Chaldaeans, and Aramaeans to Samarina.³⁷⁰ He populated Dūr Šarrukīn and the new agricultural settlements with deportees from the west,³⁷¹ as well as an estimated 239,285 deportees from the “four corners,” used them according to their skills, and counted them as Assyrians subject to taxation.³⁷² His policy meant a constant exchange of populations across the empire to serve in the army, public works, crafts, and agricultural labor.³⁷³

³⁶⁵ Eph'al, “On Warfare,” 96–97; Oded, *War*, 96, 173.

³⁶⁶ Dubovsky, *Hezekiah*, 65–66.

³⁶⁷ Mayer, *Politik*, 65.

³⁶⁸ Parpola and Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties*, xxiv.

³⁶⁹ Malbran-Labat, *L'armée*, 41.

³⁷⁰ Liverani, “Impact,” 151; Stern, *Assyrian*, 3, 8–10, 19, 132; Younger, “Repopulation of Samaria,” 254; Tadmor, *Campaigns*, 34; Na'aman, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors*, 203.

³⁷¹ Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 37–40.

³⁷² Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 77.

³⁷³ Postgate, “Economic Structure,” 209–10.

Sargon II plundered and taxed “treasures without number.”³⁷⁴ His letters attest to his elaborate administrative system, control of information, balance of details with propaganda, the role of the scribes, and the secret military service.³⁷⁵ Sargon II extended Tiglath-pileser III’s policy of annexation and used the *māmītu* (oath) and *adê* (treaty) to glorify ^dAššur and to subordinate, pacify, and annex lands and peoples under the ideology of the political law that the strong rule the weak under the universal supremacy of ^dAššur.³⁷⁶

5.7. Sennacherib (704–681 B.C.E.)

The *ummiānū* record both familiar and new royal characteristics and titles for the king in the Annals of Sennacherib, as follows:

Col. i (1) ^{md}EN.ZU-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-URU-NA LUGAL GAL-*u*₂ ... (3) *ri-e*₂-*um it-pi-šu*₂ (4) *mi-gir* DINGIR.MEŠ *na-šir kit-ti* (5) *ra-ʾim mi-ša-ri* ... (6) *a-lik tap-pu-ut a-ki-i* ... *la-ʾit* (9) *la ma-gi-ri* ... (10) ^d*aš-šur* ... LUGAL-*ut la ša-na-an* (11) *u*₂-*šat-li-ma-an-ni-ma*. ... (15) *gim-ri šal-mat* SAG *u*₂-*šak-niš še-pu-u*₂-*a* ... (20) *i-na maḥ-ri-e gir-ri-ia* ... (49) *LU*₂ *a-ra-mu la kan-šu*₂-*ti* (50) *mit-ḥar-iš ak-šud* 208,000 UN.MEŠ ... (53) *šal-la-tu ka-bit-tu aš-lu-la a-na qe-reb* KUR *aš-šur KI* ... (57) *ba-ḥu-la-ti* (58) URU *ḥi-rim-me* ... *i-na* GIŠ TUKUL.MEŠ *u*₂-*šam-qit-ma* (59) *we-du ul e-zib* ... (60) *na-gu-u*₂ (61) *šu*₂-*a-tu a-na eš-šu-ti aš-but* ... (65) *i-na* MIN-*e gir-ri-ia* ^d*aš-šur be-li*₂ *u*₂-*tak-kil-an-ni-ma* (66) *a-na* KUR *LU*₂ *kaš-ši-i* ... (67) *la kit-nu-šu* (68) *lu a-lik* ... (74) *al-me* KUR-*ud* UN.MEŠ ... (76) *u*₂-*še-ša-am-ma šal-la-tiš am-mu* ... 78) *ab-bul aq-qur u*₂-*še-me kar-meš* ... (79) *i-na* ^dGIŠ.BAR *aq-mu-ma* ...

Col. ii (1) UN.MEŠ KUR.KUR *ki-šit-ti ŠU II-ia ina* ŠA₃ *u*₂-*še-šib*. ... (2) UN.MEŠ KUR *LU*₂ *kaš-ši-i* ... (6) *i-na* ŠU.II *LU*₂.*šu*₂-*ut* SAG-*ia LU*₂.EN. NAM URU *ar-rap-ḥa* (7) *am-nu-šu-nu-ti*. ... (37) *i-na šal-ši gir-ri-ia a-na* KUR *ḥat-ti lu al-lik* (38) ^m*lu-li-i* LUGAL URU *ši-du-un-ni pul-ḥi me-lam-me* (39) *be-lu-ti-ia is-ḥu-pu-šu*₂-*ma* ... (43) URU *ak-zi-bi* URU *ak-ku-u* ... (45) *ra-šub-bat* GIŠ TUKUL ^d*aš-šur* (46) EN-*ia is-ḥu-pu-šu*₂-*nu-ti-ma* ... (48) GUN *man-da-tu be-lu-ti-ia u*₂-*kin* ... (60) ^m*ši-id-qa-a* (61) LUGAL URU *is-qa-al-lu-na ša*₂ *la ik-nu-šu* (62) *a-na ni-ri-ia* DINGIR.MEŠ ... (63) DUMU.MEŠ [etc.]... (64) *as-su-ḥa-ma a-na* KUR *aš-šur ki u*₂-*ra-aš-šu*. ...

Col. iii (18) ^m*ḥa-za-qi*₂-*a-u*₂ *ia-u*₂-*da-ai* (19) *ša*₂ *la ik-nu-šu a-na ni-ri-ia* 46 URU.MEŠ-*šu dan-nu-ti* ... (23) *al-me* KUR-*ud* (24) 200,150 UN.MEŠ ... (27) *u*₂-*še-ša-am-ma šal-la-tiš am-nu ša-a-šu* GIM MUŠEN *qu-up-pi* (28) *qe-reb* URU *ur-sa-li-im-mu* URU LUGAL-*ti-šu* (29) *e-sir-*

³⁷⁴ Bär, *Assyrische Tribut*, 19.

³⁷⁵ Malbran-Labat, *L’armée*, 1–5; Dubovsky, *Hezekiah*, 32.

³⁷⁶ Oded, *War*, 13–38; Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 37–40.

šu URU *hal-šu* MEŠ UGU-šu *u₂-rak-kis-ma* (30) *a-ši-e* ABUL ... *u₂-tir-ra* ... (38) *pul-ḫi me-lam-me be-lu-ti-ia is-ḫu-pu-šu₂-ma*.³⁷⁷

i (1) Sennacherib, great king, ... (3) wise shepherd, (4) favorite of the gods, ... (6) who goes to the assistance of the weak ... (8) who consumes (9) the disobedient ... (10) The god Aššur, ... an incomparable office of king (11) has bestowed upon me. ... (15) All the dark-haired people he subdued at my feet. ... (20) In my first campaign, ... (49) Aramaeans not submissive, (50) all of them I conquered. 208,000 people as heavy plunder I carried away to the land of Aššur. ... (57) The soldiers of the city of Ḫirimme, ... with weapons, I cut down. I did not spare a single one. ... (60) That region (61) I reorganized. ... (65) In my second campaign, the god entrusted me, and (66) against the land of the people of Kašši, ... (67) [who were] not submissive, (68) I set out. ... (74) I surrounded, I captured. People ... (76) I carried out and counted as plunder ... (78) I destroyed. I devastated. I turned into ruins. ... (79) I set on fire. ...

Col. ii (1) People from the lands that I had conquered I settled there. ... (2) (6) Into the hands of my royal official, the governor of Arrapha, I settled them. ... (37) In my third campaign, I marched to the land of Ḫatti. Luḫi, king of the city of Sidon—the terrifying radiance of my office of lord overwhelmed him. ... (43) Akzib, Akko, ... (45) the terrifying appearance of the weapon of the god Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed them. ... (48) tribute payment ... I imposed ... (60) Šidqa, (61) king of Isqalluna, who did not submit (62) to the yoke of the gods, ... (63) his sons, etc. ... (64) I tore out and carried him away to the land of Aššur.

Col. iii (18) Hazaqiau the Iaudaite, (19) who did not submit to my yoke, 46 of his strong cities ... (23) I surrounded. I captured. 200,150 people ... (27) I carried away and counted them as plunder. As for him, like a caged bird, within his royal city of Ursalimmu, (29) I confined him. I constructed fortresses over him. ... (30) Anyone exiting the city-gate, ... I turned back. ... (38) The terrifying radiance of my office of lord overwhelmed him.

This inscription introduces Sennacherib first but then attributes his greatness, wisdom, and justice to the god Aššur alone. Sennacherib had a new focus on the universality and power of the god Aššur, who bestowed upon (*u₂-šat-li-ma*) and entrusted to (*u₂-tak-kil*) Sennacherib, the wise shepherd, the duty to bring assistance to the weak. Sennacherib also consumed the disobedient and carried forth a strong military tradition, character, and capability with confi-

³⁷⁷ Luckenbill, *Annals of Sennacherib*, 23–47, 163–87. Using Borger's *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*, I have restored the logograms to Luckenbill's transliteration.

dence in the god Aššur. This portrait of Sennacherib, “wise shepherd, favorite of the gods, ... terrifying radiance” approaches Parpola’s portrait of the wise Assyrian king, who possessed omnipotence, omniscience, wisdom, prudence, justice, mercy, love, glory, strength, and terrifying radiance (*melammû*).³⁷⁸ In another inscription of Sennacherib, “Aššur, king of the gods” held the Tablet of Destinies as “the bond of Enlil, dominion over the gods of heaven and underworld, and kingship of the Igigi and Anunnaki. ... Sennacherib, king of the world, fashioned the images of Aššur.”³⁷⁹ The tablet adjures Aššur to look after the reign of Sennacherib, and its terminology indicates a political context and an understanding of the other gods as bureaucratic entities having roles subservient to Aššur.

According to this Annals inscription, Sennacherib embarked on three campaigns to bring rebellious peoples into submission and obedience to the god. His military tactics and ideology resemble those of his predecessors. He conquered, plundered, and carried away captives from among the Aramaeans. He did not spare a single soldier and then reorganized the region. Against the people of Kašši, who would not submit, he surrounded, captured, plundered, destroyed, carried, and resettled people from other lands. In the land of Ḫatti (Canaan), he overwhelmed, surrounded, captured, and carried away 200,150 people from Iauda. He locked up Hazaqiau in his royal city Ursalimmu and confined him there with the terrifying radiance. The people of Iauda and Ursalimmu felt the fury of the terrifying radiance of Sennacherib’s office of lord.

Although he conducted three campaigns of punishment, Sennacherib did not observe the ancient command to expand the land of the empire but focused his energy on building up Nineveh and on the cult of the god ^dAššur. To that end he had destroyed Babylon and attempted to move the center of Mesopotamian civilization to Aššur city.³⁸⁰

Sennacherib did not like Babylon or Marduk, and this antipathy to the city and its god may explain why he did not follow Sargon II in mentioning Marduk in this inscription. Babylonia remained a weak and rebellious composition of various population groups, and out of exasperation with Babylon, Sennacherib destroyed it in 689 B.C.E.³⁸¹ He reduced the Babylonians to slavery (*illikū rēšūta*) and used their deportees for forced labor, plunder, and livestock; but they still survived as Assyrian subjects.³⁸² He attempted to eradicate the influence of Marduk in *māt* Aššur^{ki} and acknowledged the power of Aššur alone.³⁸³

³⁷⁸ Parpola, “Sons of God,” 16–18.

³⁷⁹ George, “Sennacherib and the Tablet of Destinies,” 133–46.

³⁸⁰ Tadmor, “World Dominion,” 61–62.

³⁸¹ Brinkman, “Sennacherib’s Babylonian Problem,” 89.

³⁸² Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 78–91.

³⁸³ Idem, *War*, 41, 42, 108.

Sennacherib had overwhelmed his disobedient subjects by means of “the terrifying appearance of the weapon of the god Aššur, my lord” (*ra-šub-bat GIŠ TUKUL* ^d*aš-šur EN-ia*) and “the terror of the radiance of my office of lord” (*pul-ḫi me-lam-me be-lu-ti-ia is-ḫu-pu-šu₂-ma*). This double attribution suggests the consistency of ideology of the overwhelming power of the *melammû* (radiance) of Aššur as well as some literary innovation. Sennacherib reiterates the power of the *melammû* and the *rašubbat* of his office of lord, whereas previous emperors had attributed their military successes to the radiance, the terror of the radiance, or the terrifying radiance (*namurrat*) of Aššur.

Although Sennacherib worshipped the god Aššur as the source of power, he overlooks an explicit recognition of the god in this inscription. One could, nonetheless, consider his recognition of the weapon of the god Aššur explicit enough. Sennacherib does not assign the credit for victory—hence for the establishment of justice, law, and order in the world—to himself, but rather to the “incomparable office of king” and the “office of lord,” which he fulfilled.

The Aššur tradition reached its peak with the religious reform of Sennacherib, which raised Aššur to the explicit superlative rank of king of the gods, who controlled the existence and fate of gods and human beings: *šar ilāni*, *šar kiššat ilāni*, *šar gimrat ilāni rabuti*, *šar ilāni AN-e u KI-tim šar AN-e u KI-tim*, *KUR-u GAL-u*, *Enlil ilāni*, *belu rabu*, and *bel ilāni kalama* (king of the gods; king of all the gods; king of the totality of the great gods; king of the gods of the heaven and earth, king of heaven and earth; great land; Enlil of the gods; great lord; lord of all the gods). Sennacherib’s theology identifies the king’s rule with the god’s nature and represents a new historical development in the theology of Aššur.³⁸⁴

The policies of Sennacherib, which included above all the subjugation of the known world to the terror of the radiance of the universal ^dAššur, brought permanent demographic, social, economic, and cultural changes to Judah and Jerusalem, according to Naʾaman. Sennacherib deported 200,250 persons from the small state of Judah and subjugated the remnant city of Jerusalem to the empire.³⁸⁵ He made Jerusalem a “primate city,” according to Steiner, in central command of the region’s economy, politics, and religion.³⁸⁶ He brought an end to the Israelite-Phoenician tradition, according to Stern, and introduced the Mesopotamian-Assyrian one instead.³⁸⁷ Sennacherib understood the power of propaganda, transformed Nineveh through building projects, and, according to Grayson, rebuilt his conquered cities in the Assyrian image.³⁸⁸

³⁸⁴ Vera Chamaza, *Omnipotenz Aššurs*, 13–17.

³⁸⁵ Naʾaman, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors*, 329–30.

³⁸⁶ Steiner, “Jerusalem,” 283–85.

³⁸⁷ Stern, *Assyrian*, 132.

³⁸⁸ Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Empires*, 113–16.

5.7. Esarhaddon (680–669 B.C.E.)

Esarhaddon carried on the tradition of the great empire of *māt Aššur*^{ki} that had begun with Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 B.C.E.) and continued down through Sargon II (721–705 B.C.E.) but stalled with Sennacherib (704–681 B.C.E.). Esarhaddon waged war to glorify Aššur *lā šunnāte zikir šaptikun* (without changing the command of your god).³⁸⁹ He carried on the traditions of royal *kittu u mēšaru* (legalness and justice) and the idea that war makes peace and proclaimed: “I establish benevolent protection over the people” (*šakin šulūli ṭābi eli nišē anāku*).³⁹⁰ Esarhaddon conquered Sidon, built a new port called Kār Aššur-aḥ-iddina (Port of Esarhaddon) and resettled it with deportees from “the people of the mountains and the sea” of Sumer, Edom, and Urartu.³⁹¹ Esarhaddon expresses the continuing task of conquest: “to attack, to plunder, to extend the border of *māt Aššur*”^{ki}.³⁹²

For his disobedience to the commands of the empire, Abdi-milkutti, king of Sidon, received punishment from Esarhaddon as recorded on Inscription A at the palace at Nineveh, as follows:

II (65) ^mabdi-mil-ku-ut-ti LUGAL URU *ši-dun-ni* (66) *la pa-liḫ₃ be-lu-ti-ia la še-mu-u zi-kir šap-ti-ia* (67) *ša UGU tam-tim gal-la-tim it-tak-lu-ma is-lu-u* GIŠ.GIŠ ^daš-šur (68) URU *ši-du-un-nu* URU *tuk-la-a-ti-šu₂ ša qe₂-reb tam-tim na-du-u₂* (69) *a-bu-biṣ as-pu-un* BAD₃-šu₂ *u šu-bat-su as-suḫ-ma* (70) *qe₂-reb tam-tim ad-di-i-ma a-šar maš-kan₂-i-šu₂ u₂ ḫal-liq* (71) ^mabdi-mil-ku-ut-ti LUGAL-šu *ša la-pa-an* GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-ia (72) AŠ ŠEN *tam-tim in-na-bit AŠ q₂-bit* ^daš-šur EN-ia (73) *ki-ma nu-u-ni ul-tu qe₂-reb tam-tim a-bar-šu-ma* (74) *ak-ki-sa* SAG DAM DUMU.MEŠ-šu₂ ... (75) UN.MEŠ ... (77) *mim-ma šum-šu₂ ... a-na mu⁻²-de-e aš₂-lu-la* (80) *a-na qe₂-reb KUR aš-šur KI u₂-pa-ḫir-ma* LUGAL.MEŠ KUR *ḫat-ti* (81) *u₂ a-ḫi tam-tim ka-li-šu-nu* AŠ *aš₂-ri ša₂-nim-ma* URU *u₂-še-piṣ-ma* (82) URU *kār^{-md} aš-šur-ŠEŠ-AŠ-na at-ta-bi ni-bit-su*. III (10) LU₂ UN.MEŠ *ḫu-bu-ut* GIŠ.PAN-ia *ša KUR-e u₂ tam-tim* (11) *ši-it* ^dUTU-ši AŠ *lib₃-bi u₂-še-šib-ma* (12) *a-na mi-šir KUR aš-šur ki u₂-tir na-gu-u₂ šu-a-tu₂* (13) *a-na eš-šu-te aš-bat* LU₂ *šu-ut-SAG-ia a-na* LU₂ *NAM-ti* (14) *UGU-šu₂-nu aš₂-kun-ma* GUN *u₂ man-da-at-tu* (15) *UGU ša₂ maḫ-ri ut-tir-ma*.³⁹³

II (65) Abdi-milkutti, king of the city of Šidon, (66) who did not fear my office of lord, did not obey the command of my lips, (67)

³⁸⁹ Oded, *War*, 14, 19, 32; Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 82:17.

³⁹⁰ Oded, *War*, 108–9; Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 35:3.

³⁹¹ Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 38.

³⁹² Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 98, 34–35 *apud* Tadmor, “World Dominion,” 55.

³⁹³ Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, I 65–III 19 (Episode 5).

who put his trust in the rolling sea and neglected the yoke of the god Aššur, (68) the city Šidon whose trust lay in the midst of the sea, (69) I swept over its wall like a flood and tore out its foundations, and (70) and threw it in the sea. The place of its settlement, I destroyed. (71) Its king, Abdi-milkutti, who in front of my weapons, (72) had fled to the sea, by command of the god Aššur, (73) like a fish, I pulled him out from the sea and (74) cut off his head. His wife, sons, ... (75) people ... (77) everything of his ... in great quantity, I plundered. (80) To the districts of the land of Aššur I collected [them]. The kings of the land of Ḫatti (81) and the coast I gathered to another city and called it the city of Kār-Esarhaddon. III (10) People that I had plundered with my bow from the mountains and sea of the east, I moved to its midst. I annexed it to the land of Aššur. That region (13) I annexed. My head official as governor (14) I set up over them. I imposed tribute and payments greater than before.

The text of Esarhaddon begins this section of the inscription with the name of the offender and his crime. The text constitutes a legal case against Abdi-milkutti of the city of Šidunnu, who “did not fear my office of lord, did not obey the command of my lips,” because Esarhaddon sought to justify its destruction and rebuilding as a market town of the empire. Like other Neo-Assyrian emperors, Esarhaddon couched his conquests in the language of a command from the god Aššur as the law of the land and the empire and, hence, his legal right and duty to punish and to plunder a city or region for its offence of disobedience to the god.

The pious prayers to the god, the legal sanction, and the imperial boasts of the king serve a royal propagandistic purpose. The inscription suggests that Esarhaddon, justified by victory, will go to the appropriate lengths and will take the appropriate measures to deal with a disobedient, noncompliant, and hence, criminal subject of the empire. Abdi-milkutti committed a crime against the state: “did not fear my office of lord, did not obey the command of my lips, put his trust in the rolling sea, and neglected the yoke of the god Aššur.” Esarhaddon went after the offender with the resources of the empire, “swept over him like a flood,” and “cut off his head.” The text records the necessary facts to keep the record straight and to attest that he did right according to the traditional methods of the empire. He obliterated the noncompliant population, demolished the city, built a new one, and imported people from the “mountains and sea of east.” He renamed the city after himself (Port-Esarhaddon), annexed it to the empire, and imposed high rates of tribute payments. This inscription presents the justification of Esarhaddon, who executed his royal duty in conformity to the consistent law of the empire.

By contrast, Baal, the ruler of Tyre, because of his obedient and compliant attitude and actions, received favorable treatment, trade privileges guaran-

teed by *adê* agreement, and regal status from the emperor Esarhaddon, as the following text illustrates:

I (1) *a-de-e* ... (2) *ba-a-lu* LUGAL KUR *šur-ri* ... III (2) ^{md}*aš-šur*-PAB-AŠ-*na* LUGAL KUR *aš-šur* ... (18) *an-nu-te* KAR.MEŠ KASKAL.MEŠ *ša*₂ ^m*aš-šur*-PAB-AŠ MAN KUR *aš-šur a-na* ^m*ba-a-lu* ARAD-*šu*₂ [*ip-qi-du-ni*] ... (27) *in-na-ga-ru-u-ni pi-ir-ku* ... (28) AŠ ŠA₃ GIŠ.MA₂.MEŠ-*šu*₂-*nu la i-ḥa-ṭi* AŠ ŠA₃ KUR.³⁹⁴
I (1) *Adê*-treaty ... (2) Baal, king of Tyre, ... III (2) with Esarhaddon, king of the land of Aššur. ... (18) These are the ports and the trade routes which Esarhaddon, king of the land of Aššur, [commissioned] to his servant Baal. ... (28) No one shall commit a crime against anyone hired to work in the ships in that land.

This *adê* treaty exemplifies the fair treatment received by a city in the empire that cooperated with the empire and obeyed the commands with the king. It reflects the world of the inscriptions in which the god Aššur causes things, the king and the people alike obey Aššur, and thus the empire prospers.³⁹⁵

Esarhaddon's Letter to the god Aššur provides a manifesto of Neo-Assyrian ideology in its summation of the relationships of the god, the king, and the subjugated peoples under the command of the king and the oath to the king or the god. In the eighth year of Esarhaddon's rule (672 B.C.E.), he wrote the Letter to justify his conquest and annexation of a small kingdom called Šubria located to the northwest of Assyria.³⁹⁶ The following excerpt telescopes the Letter from the initial warning to the final annexation:

I (1) *la na-šir zik-ri aš-šur* LUGAL DINGIR.MEŠ *la pa-liḥ*₃ EN-*ti-ia* (2) *ḥab-ba-tu*₂ *šar-ra-qu lu* *ša*₂ *ḥi-ṭu iḥ-ṭu-u da-mi it-bu-ku* ... II (18) *ša*₂ *a-na* ^d*aš-šur* LUGAL DINGIR.MEŠ *e-gu-u a-mat* ^m*aš-šur*-PAB-AŠ-*na* LUGAL ŠAR₂ EN-*šu*₂ *la i-šem-mu-u* ... (21) *ḥi-it-ṭu dan-nu a-na* ^d*aš-šur aḥ-ṭi a-mat* LUGAL EN-*ia ul aš*₂-*me* ... (23) *ma-mit* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ *ša*₂ *e-ti-qu* ... (25) *ana-ku* ^m*aš-šur*-PAB-AŠ-*na* LUGAL *dan-nu* *ša*₂ *qi*₂-*bit-su la* BAL-*u(enû)* *la uš-tam-sa-ku a-mat ru-bu-ti-šu*₂ ... (30) *la taš-ma-a zi-kir šap-ti-ia*₂ ... (32) GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ *aš-šur ez-zu-ti ta-ad-ka-a* ... II (33) AŠ *pi-i* DINGIR.MEŠ *šu-ut AN KI* (34) *it-ta-ša-a sa-pa-aḥ KUR-ka* ... (35) *iq-qa-bi* *ša*₂-*lal UN.MEŠ-ka* ... IV (2) URU.MEŠ *šu-a-tu-nu* *ša*₂ AŠ *e-muq* ... (3) *ap-pu-lu aq-qu-ru* AŠ ^dGIRA *aq-mu* ... (4) *ki-i qi*₂-*bit aš-šur EN-ia*₂ *u*₂-*tir-ma*.³⁹⁷

³⁹⁴ Ibid., 107–9; Parpola and Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties*, 24–27.

³⁹⁵ Oded, *War*, 20.

³⁹⁶ Eph'al and Tadmor, "Observations," 155.

³⁹⁷ Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 102–7.

I (1) Whoever does not keep the command of Aššur, the king of the gods, or does not fear my office of lord, (2) plunderer, thief; whoever commits a crime or spills blood ... II (18) Whoever neglects Aššur, the king of the gods, or does not obey the command of Esarhaddon, the king of the world, his lordship, ... (21) "I committed a great crime against the god Aššur because I did not obey the command of the king my lord. ... (23) The oath of the great gods, I broke." ... (25) I, Esarhaddon, great king, whose command does not change, whose princely command cannot be denied, ... (30) You did not obey the command of my lips. ... (32) You have stirred up the weapons of Aššur. ... II (33) Out of the mouth of the gods of heaven and earth, (34) came forth the destruction of your land ... (35) and was commanded the plundering of your people. IV (2) These cities, through the power [of Aššur], (3) I tore down. I demolished. I burned with fire. ... (4) By the command of Aššur my lord, I repeated.

Here Esarhaddon's text states the law of the empire regarding obedience to the emperor and to ^dAššur. Whoever does not keep the command of the god Aššur will stir up the weapons of the god and suffer destruction by the command of the god. It presupposes "the oath of the great gods," which the subordinate person, city, or land cannot offend.

The king will destroy with the weapons of Aššur those who disobey the lawful command of the king. This law of obedience applied down the ladder of the administrative hierarchy so that an act of disobedience to a superior amounted to an unlawful act of disobedience to the god Aššur. Such a law would go into effect by the command of Aššur, and an infraction of it would result in death, destruction, or deportation. The law of the land, conceived as the command of the king as servant of the god Aššur, as stated by Esarhaddon, presupposed one principal universal god, Aššur, to whom the four corners of the world owed obedience.

Two innovations to the ideology appear under the rule of Esarhaddon. The *raggintu* take on more significance for the king, and the scholars take on a more active role in maintaining the political balance between Aššur and Babylonia. The Covenant Tablet of Aššur blends the identities of the gods Aššur and Ištar, and in this tablet, Ištar makes a covenant with the other gods on behalf of Esarhaddon.³⁹⁸ In the oracles, Ištar expresses support for Esarhaddon: *anāku bēlet Arbail ... lā tapallaḥ šarrūtu ikkū danānu ikkūma* (I am the Lady of Arbela. ... Now fear not, king! The kingdom is yours, yours is the power).³⁹⁹ Esarhaddon evinces less focus on the military imperial god

³⁹⁸ Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, XVIII.

³⁹⁹ SAA 9 1.8 vv. 12–23 apud Nissinen, *References to Prophecy*, 22.

Aššur and lists instead eighteen gods as his divine patrons and objects of divine worship.⁴⁰⁰ Esarhaddon implored the gods thus: “With raised hands I prayed to Aššur, Sîn, Šamaš, ... They sent me this oracle of encouragement: ‘Go ahead, do not hold back! ... We annihilate your enemies.’”⁴⁰¹ In his relationship with the *raggintu* of Ištar, Esarhaddon, by seeking approval of the pantheon, appears less confident of his mission to obey the command of the god Aššur.

Esarhaddon’s scribes (*ummiānū*) played a large role in formulating his policy toward creating an image of a single, unified, peaceful nation with Babylon under the rule of Aššur, according to Porter. They used images and symbols of kingship and nation as tools to support Esarhaddon’s claim of kingship in Babylon. Diplomatic royal inscriptions included the Babylonians and the Babylonian *ilu* Marduk as part of one people under Assyrian rule. Esarhaddon feared the word of Aššur, Nabû, and Marduk and built the temples of Aššur, Ešarra, and Marduk. He and his scholars made Aššur the father of the *ilû* and Marduk the god’s *aplu rēštu* (first son).⁴⁰² Esarhaddon thus comes across as a consummate political leader, who marshaled the military and civil administrations under Aššur, garnered support from the temples of Ištar, and unified the two warring lands of Assyria and Babylonia by exhibiting great public respect for the god Marduk. In doing this he employed the help of both the *raggintu* of the temples and the scholars of the palace. The temple personnel—*raggintu* and *maḥḥû*—could turn up as potential betrayers of the king, according to Nissinen, even though writings indicate a close relationship of the temple servants to the king. An idea contrary to the legitimate royal ideology or a proclamation in favor of the loyalty to some other king or god identified the temple servant as a betrayer.⁴⁰³

Under Esarhaddon’s rule, the *ummiānū*, who remain behind the scenes of the inscriptions, appear to gain even more power as the spokespersons, mediators, and purveyors of the universal law and power of the god Aššur. They appear to have held the balance of power over the *raggintu* proclaimers in the empire even though Esarhaddon pays much homage to Ištar and the proclaimers and none to the invisible authors of the inscriptions.

The policies of Esarhaddon differ from those of his predecessors, first, in the involvement in the affairs of state of the *raggintū* (diviners) and *maḥḥū* (ecstatics) of the goddess ^dIštar.⁴⁰⁴ The identities of ^dIštar and ^dAššur blended,⁴⁰⁵ but Esarhaddon did not accept *raggintu* utterances that contradicted official policy. The *raggintu* did not accompany the armies and appear

⁴⁰⁰ Porter, “Anxiety,” 226–27.

⁴⁰¹ Jong, *Isaiah*, 299.

⁴⁰² Porter, *Images*, 3, 120–25.

⁴⁰³ Nissinen, *References to Prophecy*, 161–62.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 161.

⁴⁰⁵ Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, XVIII, 4.

to have had little effect on imperial policy or the periphery of the empire.⁴⁰⁶ The letters of the scribes to Esarhaddon, however, attest to the continuing integral role of the scribes in the military and imperial administration.⁴⁰⁷ He continued the policy of oath and treaty but went even further in assembling all his subjects to swear *adê* oaths to him and his son Aššurbanipal.⁴⁰⁸ Esarhaddon encouraged the private and official business of the *tamkārū* (businessmen) and of the craftsmen guilds, but enslaved many Babylonians.⁴⁰⁹ He encouraged Baal of Tyre but destroyed Sidon and renamed it Kār-Esarhaddon.⁴¹⁰ He continued but with less intensity to channel deportees across the empire to meet economic needs.⁴¹¹ *Maddattu* paid for the costs of the court, the construction, the troops, and the campaigns, which devoured giant sums.⁴¹² Esarhaddon waged war to glorify Aššur and conquest to use conquest and treaty documents to subjugate countries but with his rival power Babylon introduced sophisticated measures of propaganda and psychological warfare.⁴¹³ Esarhaddon explained that his father, Sennacherib, had destroyed Babylon because of its sins against Marduk,⁴¹⁴ but Esarhaddon represented *kittu u mēšaru* (legalness and justice).⁴¹⁵ The scholars of Esarhaddon's reign created the political image of a single, unified, peaceful nation under the rule of Aššur, where Aššur became the "father of the *ilû*," and Marduk became the *aplu rēštu* "first heir/son."⁴¹⁶

5.8. Aššurbanipal (669–627 B.C.E.)

Aššurbanipal's Prism B reports a command from the god Aššur to embark on a war, but the command arrives in the form of a message of encouragement from ecstasies, as follows:

ad-ke ERIM.MEŠ MÈ-ia mun-daḥ-še ... ina qí-bit AN.ŠÁR ^dAMAR.UTU
... šá ú-tak-kil-ú-in-ni ina ... ši-pir maḥ-ḥe-e ... SAG.DU ^mte-um-man
... KUD-is ... mi-lam-me ^dAN.ŠÁR u ^d15 KUR.NIM.MA.KI is-ḥu-up-ma
ik-nu-šú a-na ni-ri-ia.⁴¹⁷

⁴⁰⁶ Nissinen, *References to Prophecy*, 161.

⁴⁰⁷ Malbran-Labat, *L'armée*, 1–5.

⁴⁰⁸ Grayson, "Treaties," 132–34; Tadmor, "Assyria and the West," 37–43.

⁴⁰⁹ Elat, "tamkārū," 244; Postgate, "Economic Structure," 205; Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 91–92.

⁴¹⁰ Malbran-Labat, *L'armée*, 13.

⁴¹¹ Postgate, "Economic Structure," 209–10.

⁴¹² Bär, *Assyrische Tribut*, 19.

⁴¹³ Oded, *War*, 13; Tadmor, "World Dominion," 55.

⁴¹⁴ Brinkman, "Through a Glass Darkly," 36, 39, 40; Holloway, *Aššur is King*, 380.

⁴¹⁵ Oded, *War*, 20.

⁴¹⁶ Porter, *Images*, 119–53.

⁴¹⁷ Nissinen, *References to Prophecy*, 45.

I mobilized my combat forces ... Upon the command of Aššur and Marduk, ... who encouraged me by ... a message of ecstasies ... I cut off the head of Teumman ... The terrifying radiance of Aššur and Ištar beat Elam down, and they submitted to my yoke.

This pattern of consulting the *maḥḥē* (ecstasies) for communication with the gods Aššur, Marduk, and Ištar follows the pattern that Esarhaddon pursued in consulting the *raggintu* (proclaimers) of Ištar. The literate Aššurbanipal uses a more theological designation for the god Aššur—AN.ŠAR₂ (*dingir-kiššatu*; god-of-heaven and the totality).⁴¹⁸

War presupposes the divine justification of Aššur, but Aššurbanipal acts here under the consensus command of Ištar, Aššur, Marduk, and Sin delivered to him by means of ecstasies (*maḥḥū*), who had the power to relay the command of the gods to the king.⁴¹⁹ The *maḥḥū* belonged to the machinery of imperial propaganda and functioned to legitimate Assyrian royal ideology as the law of the empire even before Esarhaddon and Aššurbanipal, but references to the authority and encouragement of the *maḥḥū* do not appear in the inscriptions of the earlier Assyrian kings. Similar references to the *maḥḥū* appear in foreign texts: Old Babylonian letters from Mari mention oracles delivered by *muḥḥūm* (ecstasies).⁴²⁰

The *maḥḥū* do not appear often in Aššurbanipal's texts. When he attempted to establish relations with supporters in Babylon after the civil war with Šamaš-šumu-ukin (652–648 B.C.E.), he wrote out the treaty of Aššurbanipal with Babylonian allies. The treaty includes an oath made in the first person, as the following text attests:

LUGAL KUR-aš-šur.KI EN-i-ni ... ni-na-aš-ša-ru ma-la ^mAN.ŠAR₂-
DU₃-DUMU.UŠ LUGAL KUR-aš-šur.KI EN-a-ni i-qab-ba-an-na-a-šu₂
a-ki-i pi-i-šu₂.⁴²¹

We shall protect the king of the land of Aššur. We shall do everything that Aššurbanipal, king of Assyria, our lord, tells us to do according to his command.

The oath does not mention gods, ecstasies, or proclaimers but relates to the king and his command.

The literate Aššurbanipal might have taken part in the writing of his Tahrqa inscription in which he describes himself as a creation of the god Aššur, as follows:

⁴¹⁸ Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*, 248, 388.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., 164; Prism B: v 77–vi 16.

⁴²⁰ Jong, *Isaiah*, 287.

⁴²¹ Parpola and Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties*, xxxii.

Col. I. (1) *a-na-ku* ^{md}*aš-šur*-DU₃-AŠ *bi-nu-tu* ^d*aš-šur* ... (2) DUMU LUGAL GAL-U₂ *ša₂ E₂ ri-du-u-ti* ... (13) AŠ *e-peš pi-i mut-tal-li* (14) *ša₂ ^daš-šur* ... (18) *u-paḥ-ḥir* UN.MEŠ KUR ^d*aš-šur* KI ... (20) *a-na na-ṣir* DUMU LUGAL-*tī-ia* u₂ EGIR-*nu* (21) LUGAL-*tu* KUR ^d*aš-šur* KI *e-pī-eš a-di-e* MU DINGIR.MEŠ (22) *u₂-ša-aš-qi-šu₂-nu-ti u₂-dan-ni-na rik-sa-a-te* ... (52) *i-na maḥ-ri-e gir-ri-ia* ... (55) ^m*tar-qu-u* (56) *da-na-an* ^d*aš-šur* ... *im-ši-ma* (57) *it-ta-kil a-na e-muq ra-man-i-šu* ... (66) *ad-ki-e* NA *e-mu-qi₂-ia ṣi-ra-a-te* *ša ^daš-šur u ^dINNIN* (67) *u₂-mal-lu-u* ŠU.II-*u-a* ... (84) *nam-ri-ri* ^d*aš-šur u ^dINNIN is-ḥu-pu-šu-ma* ... (85) *me-lam-me* LUGAL-*u-ti-ia ik-tu-mu-šu-ma* ... (118) LUGAL.MEŠ *an-nu-ti* ... AŠ *a-di-ia iḥ-ṭu-u₂* (119) *la iṣ-ṣu-ru ma-mit* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ ... (132) *ma-mit* ^d*aš-šur* LUGAL DINGIR.MEŠ *ik-šu₂-us-su-nu-ti-ma* *ša iḥ-ṭu-u* AŠ *a-di-e* (133) DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ ... (134) *u₂* UN.MEŠ ... Col. II (2) AŠ GIŠ TUKUL.MEŠ *u₂-šam-qi-tu e-du a-me-lum la e-zi-bu* ... (8) *a-na ^mni-ku-u ... ri-e-mu ar-ši-šu-ma u-bal-liṭ nap-šat-su* (9) *a-di-e* UGU *ša maḥ-ri u₂-ša-tir-ma it-ti-šu aš-kun*.⁴²²

Col. I (1) I am Aššurbanipal, creation of the god Aššur, ... (2) eldest son of the king from the crown prince's palace ... (13) In carrying out the noble command (14) of the god Aššur, ... (18) the people of the land of the god Aššur assembled ... (20) to support me in my succession to the future (21) crown principality of the land of the god Aššur. Oaths by the great gods (22) they swore and guaranteed the treaties. ... (52) In my first campaign ... (55) Tarḫu [Taharqa] (56) forgot the power of the god Aššur. (57) He trusted in his own strength ... (66) I called up the powerful army that the god Aššur and goddess Ištar (67) had entrusted to my hands. ... (84) The brilliant radiance of the god Aššur and goddess Ištar overwhelmed him. ... (85) The terrifying radiance of my office of king covered him. ... (118) These kings ... broke my treaty. (119) They did not remember the oath of the great gods. ... (132) The oath of the god Aššur, king of the gods, caught up with them because they had offended against the treaty of (133) the great gods. ... (134) Now the people ... Col. II (2) I have struck down with the weapons; not a single man did I leave behind. ... (8) Upon Necho, ... I endowed mercy and revived his life. (9) I imposed on him treaty obligations greater than before.⁴²³

The designation, “creation of the god Aššur” (*bi-nu-tu* ^d*aš-šur*), suggests that Aššurbanipal maintained the theology of Sennacherib. Aššurbanipal justifies

⁴²² Streck, *Assurbanipal*, 4–19, 66–78. I have restored the logograms by means of Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*.

⁴²³ My translation follows the Akkadian and Streck's German translation.

his actions according to the ancient imperial doctrine of obedience to the commands of the god to defeat the usurper Taharqa, who had forgotten the oath of the great gods, so the brilliant and terrifying radiance of the god Aššur and the goddess Ištar overwhelmed him.

Aššurbanipal's inscription uses an assortment of terms for treaties and oaths: I (21) treaties the great gods (*a-di-e* MU DINGIR.MEŠ), (22) the treaties (*rik-sa-a-te*), (118) my treaties (*a-di-ia*), (119) oath to the great gods (*ma-mit* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ), (132) oath of Aššur (*ma-mit* ^d*aš-šur*), (133) treaties of the great gods (*a-di-e* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ), and II (9) treaties (*a-di-e*). In this statement of justification and policy, Aššurbanipal places much warrant on the importance of oath and the breaking of oath, just as if it constitutes a breaking of a law and hence a sentence of death for Taharqa. The idea that "Tarqu/Taharqa forgot the power of the god Aššur" refers to the standard accusation of the breaking of an oath that the Assyrians imposed against their enemies as a justification for war. The inscription portrays the enemy as an offender, who "trusted in his own strength," according to Oded. Such a justification for war encodes a belief in the causal relationship between the behavior of humanity and the actions of gods.⁴²⁴

The two prominent mentions of Ištar together with Aššur—"radiance of Aššur and Ištar" and "powerful army of Aššur and Ištar" (*nam-ri-ri* ^d*aš-šur u* ^dINNIN and *e-mu-qi₂-ia ši-ra-a-te ša* ^d*aš-šur u* ^dINNIN—indicate that Aššurbanipal carried on the concern of his father Esarhaddon for divine justification of his actions from the goddess Ištar. They also suggest, however, that perhaps Aššurbanipal raised the goddess in rank to have some authority over the decisions of the king and movements of Aššur's army. Such input of encouragement, however, would not supersede the crucial and practical influence of the king's military advisors.

Aššurbanipal, nonetheless, added the goddess Ištar to the phrases employed by his predecessors to indicate the source of Assyrian power: "the powerful army that the god Aššur and goddess Ištar had entrusted to my hands." Aššurbanipal's powerful army (*e-mu-qi₂-ia ši-ra-a-te*) ... the brilliant radiance (*nam-ri-ri*) ... the terrifying radiance (*me-lam-me*) points to a crucial theme in the imperial ideology.

Esarhaddon had consulted the *raggintu* of Ištar, and Aššurbanipal's addition to the formula suggests that Aššurbanipal followed his father and paid homage to the political importance of the goddess Ištar. It suggests that the *raggintu* of the temple of Ištar had considerable and unprecedented power within the inner circle of first Esarhaddon's and then Aššurbanipal's government and army.

According to the Taharqa text, "the people of the land of the god Aššur assembled ... to support me in my succession to the future" and thus to ratify

⁴²⁴ Oded, *War*, 11, 121.

Aššurbanipal's claim to office of crown prince and king by consensus and treaty. Although Aššur alone decided fate and had control of the universe, still the gods and the people had to affirm Aššur's decrees and the appointment of Aššurbanipal. Aššurbanipal did not waste time before going out on a standard campaign to punish the forgetful Tarqû/Taharqa of Egypt, who had reneged on his treaties. Aššurbanipal thus listened to his military advisors and the scholars, who knew the actual situation on the ground at the furthest reaches of the empire.

In this case, as noted above, the "brilliant radiance of the god Aššur and goddess Ištar overwhelmed him ... and the terrifying radiance of my office of king covered him." Aššurbanipal left no one standing on the battlefield as the *ummiānū* report, "not a single man did I leave behind." Yet he had mercy on the compliant Necho and left after imposing more onerous tribute payments. Having mercy on submissive rulers had an economic value, because the Assyrians collected *biltu* (tax) from the assimilated provinces and from compliant states, like that of Necho, which had maintained their indigenous government. The obedient Necho, however, would not stay that way for long and rebelled later to fight a weakened empire.

Aššurbanipal continued the policy of destroying, repopulating, and rebuilding a state in the image of *māt* ^dAššur for its violation of an *adê* stipulation.⁴²⁵ Although he still distributed deportees to forced labor in the provinces, he did it with less intensity.⁴²⁶ His letters indicate a continuation of the imperial intelligence, secret services, and psychological warfare as the treaty of Aššurbanipal with his Babylonian allies (652–648 B.C.E.) attests.⁴²⁷ Literate Aššurbanipal patronized Nabû, the god of the scribes, and collected a treasury of literature in Nineveh.⁴²⁸ The prism of Aššurbanipal's war with Mannea illustrates his continuance of the policy of conquest in service of ^dAššur and with the consensus of the local gods of *māt* ^dAššur, as follows:⁴²⁹

ina qí-bit AN.ŠÁR [etc. ...] ap-pul aq-qur ina ^dGIŠ.BAR *aq-mu ...*
UN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ANŠE.MEŠ GU₄.MEŠ *u še-e-ni TA qé-reb*
URU.MEŠ *šá-a-tú-nu ú-še-ša-am-ma šal-la-tiš am-nu.*

Upon the command of Aššur, [Sin, Šamaš, Adad, Bel, Nabû, Ištar of Nineveh, the Lady of Kidmuri, Ištar of Arbela, Ninurta, Nergal, and Nusku. I entered the midst of Mannea and triumphantly marched.] I conquered, devastated, destroyed, and burned with fire [its fortified cities and numberless small towns]. The people,

⁴²⁵ Liverani, "Impact," 163; Tadmor, "World Dominion," 55.

⁴²⁶ Postgate, "Economic Structure," 209–10; Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 2–4.

⁴²⁷ Malbran-Labat, *L'armée*, 1–5; Parpola/Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties*, xxxii.

⁴²⁸ Grayson, "Assyrian Civilization," 228.

⁴²⁹ Nissinen, *References to Prophecy*, 43–44; Prism A ii 126–iii 26.

horses, rams, bulls, and sheep I removed from these cities and counted them among the plunder.

Aššurbanipal's hierarchy of gods reflects the changing hierarchy of the Assyrian ruling class.⁴³⁰ *Raggintū* and *maḥḥū*, however, did not live in the palace, did not advise the king on crucial matters, and remained subordinate to the royal court.⁴³¹

5.9. *Neo-Assyrian Imperial Ideology: Hypotheses*

Aššurnāṣirpal II, the king of the world, rules the whole world, conquers the lands, disperses enemies, and receives tribute. The terror of Aššur his lord overwhelmed his enemies, and he piled up their bodies and plundered their goods. The god Aššur gave him the merciless weapon and set the lands at his feet, and the conqueror of the enemies of Aššur imposed tax and tribute on them. The god Aššur commanded him to subdue the lands. He massacred, demolished, burned them with the radiance of the god Aššur, and imposed seizure, payments, and labor upon them. He did not leave one of them alive. The rest of the inhabitants, he resettled in the midst of Kalḫu.

Šalmaneser III, king of the peoples and city-prince of Aššur, heeds the commands of the gods Aššur and Šamaš, to conquer the regions of the upper and lower seas. He used the strong weapon of Aššur to kill the disobedient and to subdue the unsubmitive. With the fear of the radiance of Aššur his lord, by the command of the god, he scattered their forces, besieged the city, and carried off plunder. He killed and annihilated his enemies, and they submitted. He razed, destroyed, and burned, and then he rebuilt Kār-Šalmaneser. With the radiance of his weapons and under the command of the god, he plundered the coast of the sea.

Tiglath-pileser III extended the imperial policy of conquest. His policy of annexation required a standing permanent army and introduced systematic economic, cultural, and ethnic integration. He destroyed urban centers, deported the population, reconstructed the capital in Assyrian style, installed an Assyrian governor and garrisons, and imposed uniform taxation, conscription, imperial standards and measures, and a *lingua franca* of Aramaic. The provincial system concentrated wealth and power in the provincial capital and the military elite, and the role of Aššur became preeminent among the other gods. In the service of the military god Aššur, Tiglath-pileser III conducted psychological warfare by a combination of diplomatic negotiation, promises of special treatment, and threats of dire consequences for noncompliance. Aššur's role as the military god in the empire versus other gods, had

⁴³⁰ Porter, "Anxiety," 258–60.

⁴³¹ Jong, *Isaiah*, 300.

become defining. He projected, with overwhelming military power and a political imperial model of unitary and universal jurisdiction to transform the four corners of the world. Tiglath-pileser III's policy of annexation transformed deported people into Assyrians, who accepted the yoke of Aššur. He transformed lands into productive farms in the service of Aššur. The annexation of a territory entailed the destruction of noncompliant populations and the thorough Assyrianization of compliant populations. The god Aššur became the supreme god, "who decides fates" and around whom Tiglath-pileser III could arrange his centralized imperial and military administration. Nabû, the god of the *ummiānū* scholars, held a preeminent place in the hierarchy over the remaining gods.

Sargon II received his commission from the gods Aššur and Marduk and acknowledged the influence of the Babylonian *maḥḥū* (ecstatics) and *raggintu* (proclaimers). He deported the inhabitants of Samerina, resettled people from Tu'muna in Ḫatti Land, plundered the people of Kiakki, and conquered the land of Mannaya. Thus he punished people who had offended the god and thrown off the yoke of Aššur. He maintained the empire by means of the terrifying radiance of the god Aššur. Nothing about his ideology in this inscription suggests further interest in Marduk.

Sennacherib boasted of his wisdom and his special relationship with Aššur. His theology raised Aššur above Marduk and made the Assyrian god the god of the universe and the creator of the world. Sennacherib did not follow the god's command to expand the land of the empire but did conduct devastating campaigns of punishment against Babylon and Canaan. Sennacherib overwhelmed the enemies of Aššur by means of the terrifying appearance of the weapon of the god. Sennacherib's campaigns and theology had lasting results.

Esarhaddon punished Abdi-milkutti of Sidon for his lack of fear of ^dAššur and his disobedience to the commands of the god by destroying, plundering, resettling, and annexing the city. He gave a favored status to the compliant Baal of Tyre and did not annex the city. His Letter to the God repeats his adherence to the imperial ideology and obedience to the command of the god. Yet Esarhaddon takes a conciliatory approach with the incorrigible Babylon and works with his scholars to pursue a balanced and fair policy and propaganda within the parameters of the imperial worldview. He paid an unusual amount of attention to the *raggintu* of Ištar and to the interests of the domestic pantheon.

Aššurbanipal received commands from the god Aššur from ecstatics. He introduced a new theological term—AN.ŠAR₂. His use of the *maḥḥū* suggests a new command structure by consensus of Ištar, Aššur, Marduk, and Sin. Yet his treaty with Babylonian allies included a personal oath made in the first person, and Aššurbanipal maintained the ancient imperial doctrine of obedience to the commands of the god. The breaking of an oath constituted a crime against the state law and carried a sentence of death. The goddess Ištar

shared the brilliant radiance of the god Aššur and overwhelmed enemies, and the *raggintu* of the temple of Ištar had unprecedented say in military affairs. The people assembled to support Aššurbanipal's claim to office of king, and Aššurbanipal took the radiance of the gods to punish Taharqa of Egypt.

The Assyrian emperors projected power under the military tutelage of the god Aššur. Although the tendency to acknowledge Aššur as the one creator god reached its peak with Sennacherib, other emperors sought recognition of other gods and thus tried to accomplish political reconciliation with the gods of lands and cities, including those of Babylon, that they could not eradicate. As the empire progressed and grew, the god Aššur took on universal and imperial jurisdiction. As Aramaean and Chaldean deportees filled up the Assyrian homeland, however, the emperors accepted the influence of other gods as witnessed by Sennacherib's acknowledgment of the god Šin in his name. Overall the emperors sought to project their imperial power over the four corners of the world under the image and the rule of Aššur.

From early on in the empire, the kings regarded themselves as representatives and administrators of the god Aššur. The inscriptions recorded their compliance with the commands of Aššur to conquer the four corners of the world. The empire required treaties, *adê*, sworn by oaths, *māmītu*, from the leaders of the regions and cities that they conquered. A broken treaty or oath constituted a crime against the law of obedience and legal grounds for death, destruction, and deportation. As the empire grew and more Arameans and Chaldeans took places of responsibility in the administration, so grew the need for the internal oaths of obedience from the participants in the civil and military establishment.

The command and, hence, law of Aššur, stipulated projection of power and legal jurisdiction over lands and nations by means of the army and the fear of the *melammû* (terrifying radiance). The king and the army had the duty and the right to dispose of resistant nations in an efficient way either by eradication or by deportation for settlement in homeland estates or agricultural colonies in the provinces.

Obedience to god and king constituted one of the main elements in the ideology and the law. Disobedience constituted a capital crime and warranted the death of a nation by mass destruction or deportation and the restructuring of the offending region in the image of an obedient society. Assyrian kings left ample records of their compliance with the command of Aššur to punish disobedient subjects for the breaking of an oath or treaty.

The Assyrians measured justice by victory and conquest in war. Conquered nations and peoples became the property of the king and had no rights. Compliant and submissive subjects, however, received training in Assyrian citizenship and over time assimilated to the empire. Some deportees became important members of the military and administrative establishments. The integration of the deportees, however, required the increasing

implementation of the internal oaths of obedience and caused some increased worries about disobedience within the ranks.

In the overarching hierarchy, the god Aššur commands the king and the people. The king, however, made his decisions to go on a campaign of conquest or punishment or protection of a border area after reviewing his best and up-to-date military intelligence, which he received from the intelligence network of the literate *ummiānū* class. Then the king published his decision as a command from the god Aššur. The god Aššur had a temple of his own with priests or spokespersons, who ratified the king's decisions by divination, but the king rejected divination that contradicted his ranking *ummiānū* scholars and officers, who controlled the crucial military intelligence. Although the king made the decisions and published the commands for the war as commands of Aššur, the *ummiānū* controlled the intelligence and functioned as advisers to the king. The king could not make a sensible informed decision about a campaign without accurate and truthful information from the intelligence officers. The scholars had an invisible but influential position in the administration of the empire and thus relayed their view of the empire to history.

According to the consistent ideology in the royal inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian empire, as published by the *ummiānū*, the command of Aššur and the king constituted the law of the land and the empire. Disobedience to that command and law resulted in death, destruction, and deportation. Tiglath-pileser III's policy and law of annexation encapsulates the empire's operational and ideological means of projecting power into the four quarters.

CHAPTER 6: NEO-ASSYRIAN EMPIRE AND THE LEVANT

The military policies and ideology of the Neo-Assyrian empire led to its hegemony over the Levant during the ninth through seventh centuries B.C.E. In this chapter the study returns to the Levant under the rule of the Neo-Assyrian empire and asks: What changed? How did the small, independent trader cities of Kēna'an, like Ugarit and the Phoenician cities of the second and early first millennium B.C.E., adapt to the empire and to their status as subjugated states?

A selection of royal inscriptions from the small cities of the Levant from the ninth to the seventh century B.C.E.—Tell Fakhariyah, Moab, Karatepe, Zinjirli, Sefire, and Ḥamat—comprises the primary source material for this chapter. This western region of the Neo-Assyrian empire included upper-Euphrates Syria, southeastern Anatolia, and Canaan.⁴³² This study asks the basic journalistic questions about who authored the source and the author's interests, background, bias, and agenda. It will attempt to avoid anachronisms and unwarranted presentisms by determining when the source appeared and in what place in order to compare it to the other sources that appeared in the same time and place. This procedure follows the assumption that sources and pieces of evidence emerge from a particular time, place, and context. Then the study can ask why the author(s) produced their sources, for which audience, and for what implicit or explicit purpose. Did the inscriptions have a propagandistic purpose? This process of interrogation and analysis will help to establish the historical context of the inscriptions.

In general, the study investigates how the empire affected the self-understandings of the rulers of the small Levantine cities under the influence of the Neo-Assyrian empire. The evidence of the Levantine inscriptions of that period suggests that a significant transition in their self-image took place. The Aramaic, Phoenician, and Moabite inscriptions of first-millennium-B.C.E. Levant resemble each other in their recognition of the presence of the empire and in their effort to respond to it but differ from each other in their localized individual responses to the imperial power.

6.1. *Tell Fakhariyah Inscription*

The Aramaic-Akkadian bilingual inscription from Tell Fakhariyah provides a view of a subject Aramaean city at peace with its Assyrian overlords during the period of Aššurnāṣirpal II or Šalmaneser III in the ninth-century-B.C.E. It appears on a statue of the lord king and provincial governor Haddu Yis'i and although a part of the empire, presented no typical Assyrian boasts of mili-

⁴³² For an excellent map of the Levant under the Assyrian empire, see Kuhrt, *Ancient Near East*, 494.

tary power or praises of the god Aššur. The following excerpt presents the parts of the inscription relevant to the analysis of the power structure of the subjugated kingdom:

A (Akkadian) (1) *ana* ^d*adad gugal šamê u eršeti mušaznin* (2) *nuḥše nādin rīti u mašqīti* (3) *ana nišē kal alāni* ... (6) *ilu rēmēmû* ... (7) *āšib āl guzanu* (8) *bēli rabî bēlišu* ^m*adad-it-ī šakin māti* ^{āl-}*guzani* ... (10) *ana bullaṭ napšātišu* ... (14) *ikrumma* (15) *iqēš* ... *mannu ša šumē* (17) *unakkaru* ... (18) *adad qardu lū bēl dīnišu*.⁴³³

A (1) To Adad, canal inspector of heaven and earth, who provides wealth, who gives pasture and irrigation (3) to the people of all cities. ... (6) A merciful god, ... (7) who lives in Guzan. (8) The great lord, his lord, Adadit'i, provincial governor of the city of Guzan ... (10) for the preservation of his life ... (14) he set up (15) an offering. ... Whoever may efface my name, ... (18) may Adad, the warrior be his adversary.

B (Aramaic) (1) *dmwt' zy hdys'y zy šm qdm hddskn* (2) *gwgl šmyn w-rq mhnht 'sr w-ntn r'y* (3) *w-mšqy l-mt kln* ... (5) *'lh rḥm ... ysb* (6) *skn mr' rb mr' hdys'y mlk gwzn* ... (7) *l-ḥyy nbš-h* ... (10) *knnn w-yhb lh* ... (11) *w-zy yld šmy mn-h* ... (12) *hdd gbwr lhwy qbl-h*.⁴³⁴

B (1) Statue of Haddu Yis'i that he placed before Hadad of Sikan, (2) the controller of the waters of the sky and the earth, who pours out riches and provides pasture (3) and watered terrain to all the countries. ... (5) merciful god ... who lives (6) in Sikan, the great lord, lord Haddu Yis'i, king of Guzan ... (7) for the health of his life, ... (10) he set up as an offering ... (11) Whoever effaces my name from it, ... (12) may Hadad the warrior be his adversary.

Both inscriptions follow an Aramaic style with a dedication to the god Adad/Hadad and the governor and king Adadit'i/Haddu Yis'i followed by an appreciation of the prosperity endowed by the god. Adad, the storm-god, did not belong to a particular city.⁴³⁵ The ruler dedicated the statue to the god Adad/Hadad and inscribed it with the usual warnings about effacing it, as above: "may Adad/Hadad, the warrior, be his adversary."

Two features distinguish the Akkadian from the Aramaic inscription. The Akkadian inscription on the front of the statue started with the dedication to the god Adad and highlighted his blessings. In line 8 it mentions the name of the ruler and, in line 22, that the statue represented the ruler. In the more prominent Assyrian view then, the god Adad took preeminence over "the great lord, his lord, Adadit'i," who had the subservient position of *šakin māti*

⁴³³ Abou-Assaf, *La statue de Tell Fekherye*, 61–65.

⁴³⁴ Ibid.

⁴³⁵ Grayson, "Assyrian Civilization," 222.

(provincial governor) of the city. The Aramaic inscription on the back of the statue followed and translated the Akkadian inscription but put the name of the *mr' rb mr' hdys'y mlk gwzn* (great lord, lord Haddu Yis'i, king of Guzan) on top.

This arrangement suggests that the *šakin māti* (provincial governor) doubled as the *mr' rb mr' hdys'y mlk gwzn* (great lord, lord Haddu Yis'i, king of Guzan) and that the difference did not represent just a translation issue. The governors of the provinces (*bēl pāhāte*) had the most important jobs of collecting payments and conscripting soldiers and laborers, the *ilku* service, for the central administration.⁴³⁶ The inscription presented a viable way in which a compliant city could come to terms with the commands of the empire and thus celebrate its prosperity while giving in to the dominant power. It depicted the other side of the Assyrian empire, which brutalized resistant states but brought economic prosperity to the states that submitted to the terror of the radiance of Aššur. In this case the state of Guzan kept its name, its local Aramaean god, and (perhaps) its local ruler. Of course the inscription said nothing about whatever tribute payments the city had to make, but the lord king, provincial governor did not find them too onerous compared to the prosperity that came with the empire. According to the usual Assyrian policy, however, a provincial governor came from the ranks of the central court officials of the land of Aššur.⁴³⁷ One cannot tell from the information on the inscription whether Haddu Yis'i had local roots or not, although his theophoric name suggests a local origin.

A bilingual scribe might have worked on both inscriptions as Frederick M. Fales notes.⁴³⁸ The first part of the Assyrian inscription represented an original dedicatory text in the Standard Babylonian style of Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. The first part of the Aramaic inscription then represented a translation of that Neo-Assyrian inscription. The second part of the Aramaic inscription, however, represented an original composition of a bilingual with some transference of Akkadian calques, morphology, and syntax. The second part of the Assyrian inscription represented a translation of the Aramaic original. The double bilingual statue as a whole then reflected the confluence of the Assyrian and Aramaean cultures with the linguistic influence moving in both directions in the local sphere. Abou-Asaff, however, noted that the first part of the Aramaic inscription evinced some parallels to Aramaic inscriptions at Bar Hadad and Zakkur. He also speculated that the second part of the Aramaic inscriptions resembled a Neo-Assyrian subjugation treaty of the form that recognized a local king as an Assyrian governor.⁴³⁹

⁴³⁶ Postgate, "Economic Structure," 202.

⁴³⁷ Idem, "Land of Assur," 252–57.

⁴³⁸ Fales, "Le double bilinguisme," 233–50.

⁴³⁹ Abou-Asaff, *La statue de Tell Fekherye*, 69–79.

The observation, made by Fales about the bilingual two-directional cultural and linguistic interchanges, fits into the political situation of the region of Guzan in the ninth century B.C.E., according to Abou-Asaff.⁴⁴⁰ The two-meter grey basalt statue resembled other Neo-Assyrian statues of the empire at the time of Šalmaneser III but also had original traits, such as no royal emblems, a beard, and a tunic. Haddu Yis'i did have, however, a shawl that indicated a high-level official such as a scribe or a priest. Aššurnāṣirpal II marched on Guzan in 881 B.C.E. and collected tribute. The region of Guzan, however, did not turn up in the lists of provinces of the Assyrian empire until the year 808 B.C.E. During that intermediate period, local “kings” could remain in power in a protected state as long as they remained loyal and paid tribute. The scribe(s) would have composed the Akkadian version of the inscription for the resident Assyrian garrison and merchants and the Aramaic version for the local population. Abou-Asaf dates the statue to the years 850–825 B.C.E.

The Tell Fakhariyah text depicted a benevolent and noncontractual relationship between the god Adad/Hadad and the lord king and provincial governor. This arrangement fit with the expected Aramaic and Levantine relationships between gods and humanity. The local god, as chief irrigation expert, filled the skies and the earth with plenty of water, and prosperity ensued. The empire did not require public recognition of its god Aššur even though the presence of a provincial governor presupposed a contractual relationship with the empire and hence with the god Aššur. It even allowed the local ruler to maintain the title of lord and king. The city lived under the same Assyrian rules that required obedience to the provincial governor, but no such contract has emerged. In this inscription the god Aššur remained in the background, and the king acted as ruler and provider of peace and prosperity in cooperation with the local god and in compliance with the law of the empire.

The scribes played a special role here in communicating two perspectives on the same statue. By putting the Akkadian on the front of the statue, they acquiesced to the Assyrian masters, but then they put the name of the king at the top of the Aramaic inscription above that of the god. Such a strategy might have represented a small and subtle rebellion apparent to those who knew the local language. In such a compliant and quiet city, the Assyrian overlord had no need to express the danger of disobeying the emperor's commands but instead emphasized the prosperity of the region under the peace of the Assyrian empire. As with other such public inscriptions, this inscription communicated much about the relationships between the gods as sources of power and law and the human beings as benefactors or victims of that power and law.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., 98–108.

The Tell Fakhariyah text did not depict a society predicated upon obedience to a single law demanded by a single god nor did it describe the omnipotence of a single god. It modeled the relationship of the god to society as a natural bond but also paid tribute to a foreign imperial god, who possessed jurisdiction over the local authorities. It did not stipulate absolute obedience to the god(s) from the people and their leaders and did not demand the projection of power and the destruction of foreign societies and their gods by force or by other means of intimidation. It did not stipulate punishment by death or exile for rebellion against the god or the servant or the spokesperson of the god. The Tell Fakhariyah text expressed a concept of justice as peaceful compliance and cooperation between a lesser and a greater power. It depicted the projection of Assyrian power as a benevolent force designed to improve local production, trade, and wealth.

6.2. *Inscription of Meša' of Moab*

Discovered at Dhiban, Jordan, this inscription commemorated Meša's building of a *bmt* (holy place) to (the god) Kemoš and his successes in battle against 'mry king of yśr'l (ca. 835 B.C.E.). Biblical 'Omri of Yiśrā'el reigned ca. 882–871 B.C.E., and the biblical account concerning Meša's rebellion against the king of Israel (2 Kgs 3:4–27) mentions kings Jehoram of Israel and Jehoshaphat of Judah (ca. 851 B.C.E.). Meša's inscription might have belonged to the genre of building inscriptions.⁴⁴¹ In its depiction of the role of the national god, the inscription might also have belonged to the genre of historiography similar to the DH.⁴⁴² These conflicting facts illustrate some uncertainty concerning both the time period and the genre of the inscription. Orthography, grammar, and syntax, however, indicate a Canaanite dialect.⁴⁴³ The inscription depicted the central political goal of Meša' to accomplish the independence of his land.⁴⁴⁴

Around the same time, Aššur-našir-apli II (883–859 B.C.E.) launched his conquest of the Levant with a new goal in mind for a systematic and lasting conquest by means of his new political concept. He sought a complete unconditional subjugation of his enemies, the regular delivery of tribute and taxes, the observance of his dictated orders, the obedience of the subjugated lands to his appointed governors, and complete control of the economy of Ḫatti Land,⁴⁴⁵ which would have included the twelve states of Adad-idri's anti-Assyrian coalition: Ḫalman, Ḫamat, Israel, Byblos, Guya, Mušri, Irqa-

⁴⁴¹ COS 2:137 [Halla].

⁴⁴² Gibson, *Textbook I*, 71–77.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., 71–74; Huehnergard and Rubin, "Phyla and Waves" forthcoming.

⁴⁴⁴ Vera Chamaza, *Die Rolle Moabs*, 36.

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., 46–47.

nat, Arwad, Usanat, Ši'on, Arab tribes, and Bīt-Amman (just north of Meša'ʿs kingdom).⁴⁴⁶

Šalmaneser III (858–824 B.C.E.), according to Vera Chamaza, carried this policy forward with the destruction of the lands of Ḫatti, their kings, and their gods, as the following selection illustrates:

A-ḫu-ni DUMU-a-di-ni DINGIR.MEŠ-ni-šu₂ NUNUZ-šu₂ KUR-šu₂ NIG₂-GA E₂.GAL-šu₂ a-su-ḫa a-na UN.MEŠ KUR-ia AM-nu-šu-nu
 Aḫuni of Bit-Adini, all of his gods, the offspring of his land, and the property of his palace, I led away and reckoned them as inhabitants of my land.

Šalmaneser III sought the systematic annihilation of stubborn enemies by means of massacre, execution, plunder, deportation, occupation, and eventual loss of national identity. In 841 B.C.E., Šalmaneser III succeeded in decimating the Syrian coalition and destroying their lands, hundreds of towns, and killing tens of thousands of their men. Thereafter Assyrian annals record tribute payments from the kings of Tyre, Sidon, and Israel. After the destruction of Hazaʿel's forces, the Assyrians had an unhindered route through Cana'an to the Mediterranean coast and the Arab lands to the south. In this context Iaua, son of Ḫumrî, submitted to and paid tribute to Šalmaneser III. Unlike the king of Bīt Amman, his immediate neighbor to the north, Meša'ʿ of Moab kept away from involvement in the Damascus coalition because he would have known that resistance to Šalmaneser III carried heavy consequences. Meša'ʿ, however, took advantage of Israel's defeat and weakness under Šalmaneser III to reassert his authority over his own land and immediate surroundings. Yet the Assyrians guarded their conquests, tribute, and taxes in order to forestall a rebellion, and such oversight would have included Moab. Meša'ʿ had his stone inscribed around 841 B.C.E. during the 18th *palû* of Šalmaneser III. Meša'ʿ's abstinence from the rebellions of Israel and Damascus preserved his kingdom from subjugation to Assyria until the time of Tiglath-pileser III.⁴⁴⁷

Because the imperial armies and policies of Aššur-našir-apli II and Šalmaneser III surrounded the independent kingdom of Moab throughout the ninth century B.C.E., one can hypothesize that Meša'ʿ and his scribes would have known about the imperial policies, strategies, and rhetoric of the Assyrians. In describing the minor imperialist ventures of Meša'ʿ, his scribes used some of the same tropes that the *ummiānū* of the land of Aššur used at the same time that Aššur-našir-apli II and Šalmaneser III conquered, destroyed, and decimated Ḫatti Land and subjugated Meša'ʿs opponent, the son

⁴⁴⁶ Von Soden, *Herrscher im Alten Orient*, 78.

⁴⁴⁷ Vera Chamaza, *Die Rolle Moabs*, 49–59.

of Ḫumrî (identical with *‘mry mlk yšr’l*) in the mid-ninth century B.C.E., as the following text illustrates:

(1) *’nk mš’c bn kmš[t] ... mlk m’b ...* (3) *w’š h-bmt z’t l-Kimōš ...* (4) *ky hš’ny m-kl h-m/šlkn w-ky hr’ny b-kl šn’y.* (5) *‘mry mlk yšr’l w-y’nw ’t m’b ... y’np kmš ...* (11) *w-’lthm b-h-qr w-’ihz-h w-’hrg ’t kl h-’m* (12) *m-h-qr ryt l-kmš ...* (14) *w-y’mr ly kmš lk ’h’z ’t nb ’l yšr’l w-’hlk* (15) *b-llh w-’ithm bh ...* (16) *w-’hrg kl šb’t ’lpn gbrn w-grn w-gbrt w-grt* (17) *ky l-’Aštar-Kimōš hḫrmt-h. ...* (21) *’nk bnty ... ḫmt h-y’rn ...* (23) *bt mlk ...* (24) *h-qr* (29) *mlkt [šnm] m’t bqrn ’šr yspty ’l h-’rš ...* (32) *w-y’mr ly kmš rd hlthm b-ḫwrnn.*⁴⁴⁸
 (1) I am Meša’, son of Kemoš[t] ... king of Moab ... (3) I made this *bmt* for Kemoš ... (4) because he saved me from all the kings/assaults and caused me to triumph over all my enemies. (5) Omri, king of Israel, oppressed Moab ... angered Kemoš. ... (11) I fought against Ataroth [of Israel] and took and killed all the people (12) of the town as an offering to Kemoš. ... (14) Kemoš said to me, “Go take Nebo from Israel!” I went (15) by night and fought for it ... (16) I killed all of them, seven thousand men, boys, women, girls, maid-servants, and (17) exterminated them for the god Aštar-Kemoš. ... (21) I built ... the wall ... gates, ... (23) king’s house, (24) the city. ... (29) I ruled [two] hundred towns that I added to the land. ... Kemoš said to me, “Go down and fight against Hauronen.”

The scribe(s) introduced Meša’ as the “son of Kemoš[t]” and king of the land. According to the author(s) of the text, Meša’ appeared to have extraordinary military power and bloodthirsty aggression in spite of the small size of his state. Meša’ followed the commands of the local god Kemoš, who commanded him to fight, to take land, to slaughter noncombatant dependents of his enemies in large numbers, and to sacrifice them to the god. This militarized inscription appears to follow the literary motifs of Assyrian imperial inscriptions rather than those of smaller states, like those of Tell Fakhariyah or the later Barga’yah, that would tend to make out either treaties of compliance with the imperial power of Aššur or treaties of mutual defense, cooperation, and trade with each other. Meša’ recreated his local god, Kemoš, and his office of king in the image of an imperial power. Meša’'s inscription may then serve as a prototype for the similar sort of aggressive military story that emerged from the birdcage of Jerusalem at the end of its two-hundred-year domination by the empire.

⁴⁴⁸ *KAI* 181.

Meša'ʿs scribe(s) memorialized his reign by claiming that he obeyed the god Kemoš, engaged in building projects, and fought military campaigns.⁴⁴⁹ The military campaigns resembled the terror tactics of the Assyrian empire. Meša'ʿ assaulted and slaughtered the inhabitants of ʿAtharoth, conquered Medeba and Jahaz, took prisoners, and obeyed the command of Kemoš to assault Nebo next. He slaughtered (*hḫrmt-h*) and terrorized the Gadites and incorporated their territory into his own land. Meša'ʿ deployed siege warfare, installed governors over subject populations, and sent raiding parties against border garrisons. These tactics resembled the psychological and actual warfare tactics of the Assyrians.⁴⁵⁰ Meša'ʿ expanded control of his territory, built a capital at Dibon, extended buildings and roads, slaughtered recalcitrant populations, enslaved and incorporated others into his administration, and “Moabitized” the region under the god Kemoš. The inscription recorded the social control, both internal and international, of a nationalistic and imperialistic ideology that resembled that of the nascent Assyrian empire of the ninth century B.C.E. In its clear intent to paint a glorious picture of its conquering king rather than to record history, it also resembled the contemporaneous royal inscriptions of other small-city kings such as Zakiru of Hamath, Kilamuwa of Samʿal, and Azatiwada of Karatepe.

In recording that ideology as military practice, Meša'ʿs inscription also recorded the theology of the national god Kemoš.⁴⁵¹ Kemoš commanded a *bmt* (shrine as a sign of allegiance) and an account of the ruler's compliance with the god's commands to go to battle, to conquer land and cities, and to slaughter (*hḫrmt-h*) recalcitrant populations. The inscription carried a hint of historiography because it recorded Meša'ʿs account of his conquests. Kemoš shared some authority with the god Aštar-Kemoš to whom Meša'ʿ dedicated the slaughter of the civilians. The inscription expressed Meša'ʿs loyalty to Kemoš and Aštar-Kemoš and attributed his military failures to the anger of Kemoš and his successes to the favor of Kemoš. As Mattingly reads the inscription, it recounted a theological interpretation of Meša'ʿs history. Thus the divine warrior Kemoš won wars through brutal acts of consecration (*hḫrmt-h*) and massacres of populations by divine command. The inscription fit a pattern: oracle, departure, battle, capture, massacre (*hḫrmt-h*), and plunder. Meša'ʿs nationalistic military cult, including the practice of *hḫrmt-h*, appeared designed to terrorize the populace and to maintain control of his small empire. The inscription memorialized Meša'ʿs compliance with the gods Kemoš and Aštar-Kemoš and the national cult that bears a ninth-century-B.C.E. imperialist stamp.

The Meša'ʿ royal memorial inscription, written to legitimate Meša'ʿs position as ruler, provided insight into the distribution of power and its social

⁴⁴⁹ Dearman, “Historical Reconstruction,” 203, 204, 206–7.

⁴⁵⁰ Dubovsky, *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies*.

⁴⁵¹ Mattingly, “Moabite Religion,” 219, 232–35.

network in the nascent state of Moab. The author of the MI (as Routledge calls it) attempted to transform the segmented state of Moab into a unitary state under Mešaʿs rule. At the textual level, Routledge finds, first, narration about military campaigns and, second, biographical information about the king's performance of his duty to the gods Kemoš and Aštar-Kemoš. Kemoš worked through Mešaʿ to liberate Moab from ʿOmri. In the inscription Moab functioned as the primary political unit ruled by Mešaʿ as the servant or general of Kemoš and surrounded by other small city-states labeled "land of (city name)." Routledge's taxonomy and process of segmentation suggest that a city-state's loyalty and obedience (*mišmaʿat*), its preparedness for warfare, and its location with respect to the capital Dibon established its political place in Mešaʿs hierarchy. The practice of *hḫrm-h* indicated the policy of the gods Kemoš and Aštar-Kemoš and the king Mešaʿ to "avoid exchange" with other populations of the land.⁴⁵² Such a policy reversed the standard and expected policy of international cooperation and competition among the Levantine trader states. Kemoš and Aštar-Kemoš legitimized the policy, and Mešaʿ put it into effect. Military success legitimized Mešaʿs political power and authority and his claim to divine and ritual authority under Kemoš and Aštar-Kemoš. Kemoš and Aštar-Kemoš gave the land to Mešaʿ and received rights to the holy plunder in return.

This text defined the relationship between the god Kemoš and the king Mešaʿ. The author(s) of the text documented and publicized the king's obedience to the command of the god to act in an aggressive and military fashion to bring the whole area under the god's jurisdiction. The author(s) thus appeared to act as the special representatives and spokespersons (like the *ummiānū* and the *nēbîʾīm*) of the god in maintaining the proper relationship between the god, the king, and the people. Within the positivist definition of law, the command of the god served here as the law of the land, which the king obeyed and enforced. This depiction of the law included some cultic instructions. The text thus depicts a society dedicated to obedience to a single law demanded by a single god. Mešaʿ claimed authority and power under the omnipotence of his god Kemoš. The text modeled a relationship of the god to society as a coercive bond with contractual stipulations, such as conquest and obedience, rather than on a natural bond of a god with familial characteristics. The text portrayed the god not as external to the land but still possessing universal, imperial jurisdiction within the local jurisdiction and with the command to expand that power and control. The text stipulated the obedience of the king and his army to the god, who commanded the projection of power and the destruction of foreign populations and their gods. In this text the concept of justice consisted of service to the god in battle for the extension of the god's power. The text claimed that Mešaʿ possessed the actual historical

⁴⁵² Routledge, "Politics of Mesha:," 225–44.

means for administering the claims and stipulations of the god to march in conquest. The Meša' text depicted a power relationship derived from a god and designed for its proper use in aggressive warfare.

6.3. *Inscription of Kilamuwa of Zinjirli*

Sidon expanded in the ninth century B.C.E. into the Mediterranean and established a dynasty in Ya'udî in Anatolia.⁴⁵³ The remains of the Hittite and Aramaean city of Ya'udî, later Sam'al, are located at the archaeological site of Zinjirli Hüyük in the Anti-Taurus Mountains of modern Turkey's Gaziantep Province. The Phoenician inscription of Kilamuwa from Ya'udî (Zinjirli) at the end of the ninth century B.C.E. represents a king with a Neo-Hittite name whose scribes used an Aramaic script to write with Byblian Phoenician orthography and style.⁴⁵⁴ Kilamuwa's land of Ya'udî came under Assyrian control by the eighth century B.C.E. when its name changed to Sam'al and its language to Aramaic. The autobiographical account boasts of king Kilamuwa's accomplishments in foreign and domestic affairs.⁴⁵⁵ On the face of the inscription, Kilamuwa points to the symbols of four gods: a horned helmet of Hadad, a yoke of Rākib-El, the god of the dynasty, a winged sundisk of Šamaš, and a crescent moon of Ba'al Harrān.⁴⁵⁶ Considering the nature of the inscription and Kilamuwa's transition to allegiance with the Assyrian empire, however, the symbol of the winged sun-disk may designate the god Aššur, the crescent moon may represent the Aramaean god Sîn, and the horned helmet represents a general sign of a god in the Assyrian world. The yoke could indicate just as well the yoke of Aššur, which Kilamuwa celebrated in the inscription. The symbols at the top of the inscription thus announce a theological ambiguity that matches the political ambiguity of the following message. Kilamuwa remained in power in Yd'y while paying homage and tribute to and accepting the tutelage of the king of 'Ašur and his gods. Kilamuwa's father paid tribute to Šalmaneser III (858–824 B.C.E.) during the Assyrian king's campaign against the Aramaean coalition of Barhadad of Damascus.⁴⁵⁷ Kilamuwa then hired Šalmaneser III to help him defend against the Danunians. Aramaean Kilamuwa sought to improve the living conditions of the Anatolian population that he had conquered. The use of the Tyro-Sidonian language came from Phoenician traders and suggests influence from the Canaanite poetic tradition of Ugarit, as follows:

⁴⁵³ Peckham, "History of Phoenicia," 5:352.

⁴⁵⁴ Idem, "Phoenicians and Aramaeans," 32, 33.

⁴⁵⁵ Rosenthal, "Canaanite and Aramaic Inscriptions," 500.

⁴⁵⁶ Parker, *Stories in Scripture and Inscriptions*, 78.

⁴⁵⁷ *KAI* 1:4–5.

(1) *ʾnk klmw br hyʾ* (2) *mlk gbr ʿl Yaʾudî w-bl pʿl ...* (4) *w-ʾnk klmw br tm[] mʾš pʿlt* (5) *bl pʿl hlpnyhm kn bt ʾby bmtkt mlkm ʿd* (6) *rm w-kl šlh yd l-lhm w-kt b-yd mlkm km ʾš ʾklt* (7) *zqn w-km ʾš ʾklt yd w-ʾdr ʿly mlk dnnym w-škr* (8) *ʾnk ʿly mlk ʾšr w-ʿlmt ytn bš w-gbr b-swt //* (9) *ʾnk klmw br hyʾ yšbt ʿl ksʾ ʾby ...* (10) *... w-ʾnk l-my kt ʾb w-lmy kt ʾm* (11) *w-lmy kt ʾh w-my bl hz pn š šty bʿl ʿdr* (15) *... w-my yšht h-spr z yšht rʾš bʿl šmd ʾš l-gbr* (16) *w-yšht rʾš bʿl hmn ʾš l-bmh w-rkbʿl bʿl bt.*⁴⁵⁸

(1) I am Kilamuwa, son of Hayaʾ. (2) A man ruled over Yaʾudî but did nothing ... (4) ... But I Kilamuwa, son of Tm[], that which I did, (5) their ancestors had not done thus. My father's house was in the midst of kings, (6) their herd, and all put forth the hand to eat. But I was in the hands of the kings. Like fire, I ate (7) a beard, and like fire I ate a hand. Now the mighty king of the Dananians was against me, so I hired (8) over me the king of ʾAšur. Now he gave a young woman for a sheep and a man for a garment // (9) I am Kilamuwa, son of Hayaʾ. I sat on my father's throne ... (10) And I, to one I was like a father, and to another I was like a mother, (11) and to another I was like a brother. Now anyone who had not seen the face of a sheep, I made owner of a flock. [12–13: economic achievements] (15) ... And anyone who may destroy this writing, may Baʿal Šmd, who belongs to Gbr, destroy his head. (16) And may Baʿal Ḥaman, who belongs to the *bmh*, and Rkbʿl, lord of the house, destroy his head.

Kilamuwa's inscription commemorated his initial interaction with the Assyrian empire and the benefits that the king of ʾAšur brought. The king of ʾAšur rescued and defended Kilamuwa from the mighty king of the Danunians and brought prosperity to the land. Previous rulers of Yaʾudî did not achieve the gains that Kilamuwa achieved by hiring the Assyrians to intervene and to bring their high-value goods and manpower from the imperial market: *w-škr ʾnk ʿly mlk ʾšr* (and I hired for myself the king of Aššur). Kilamuwa betrayed no sense of conquest or coercion from the empire but instead celebrated the union and the peace and prosperity that the king of ʾAšur brought to his land. The inscription bore witness, like that of Tell Fakhariyah, to the economic and political benefits that the Assyrian empire brought to compliant and cooperative lands. It attested, at the same time, to the Assyrian policy of leaving compliant rulers of prosperous lands in place in order to facilitate the business of the empire. Kilamuwa's Phoenician and Canaanite connections attested to his business connections with the prosperous Mediterranean trade circuit, which the Phoenicians of Tyre and Sidon controlled.

⁴⁵⁸ KAI 24.

Kilamuwa's peaceful and prosperous union with the Assyrian empire entailed hidden aspects of political and military submission as Mark W. Hamilton notes.⁴⁵⁹ The historiographic rhetoric of Kilamuwa's so-called hiring of the king of 'Ašur concealed the reality of subjugation and payment of tribute. The young woman and the man that the king sold for sheep and garments represented the cheap abundance of slaves on the imperial market. Whether coerced or not, Kilamuwa's Assyrian-like appearance on the stele betrayed his emulation of and submission to the empire. Although still in power, Kilamuwa had entered the world of the empire. Gibson notes that although emulating the empire and the power of the king of 'Ašur, Kilamuwa still appealed to his local gods, Aramaean Ba'al Šamad and the imperial Phoenician Ba'al Ḥaman, for the protection of his memorial inscription.⁴⁶⁰

The professional scribe(s), who composed Kilamuwa's inscription, made use of sophisticated wordplay as Jan-Wim Wesseliuss points out.⁴⁶¹ The scribe(s) used the four alternate translations of the root *lhm*: the verbs "to fight" and "to eat" and the nouns "jaw" and "bread." The resulting inscription depicted how Kilamuwa resolved the present ambiguities and historical inadequacies of his kingdom and dynasty by hiring the king of 'Ašur to defeat the Dananians.

Kilamuwa directed the first part of his brief account, which related the events of his accession to the throne and his achievements, to his own royal court as Simon B. Parker notes.⁴⁶² Kilamuwa directed the second part of the inscription at the wider audience of his own people to whom he had brought economic prosperity by his union with the empire.

The scribe(s) of this text defined the relationship between the god, the king, and the people as one of cooperation and self-defense with the support and assistance from the king of 'Ašur. The author(s) thus, by means of the public inscription, acted as the special representatives and spokespersons of the king to maintain the proper relationship between the local god(s), the king, the people, and the visiting power in the form of the army of the god 'Ašur. Kilamuwa's rule and law consisted of eliminating contention from neighboring competitors and of bringing stable markets and prosperity to his land. He presented a paternal and protective image, which acknowledged the help and support of the empire. The text betrayed no sense of imposed or contractual obedience to a single law demanded by a single god. Kilimuwa, however, had a contractual agreement with the king of 'Ašur for his military and economic support and benefits.

Although the text did not depict the omnipotence of a single god, it did acknowledge the overwhelming and dominant power of the beneficent king

⁴⁵⁹ Hamilton, "Past as Destiny," 222–25.

⁴⁶⁰ Gibson, *Textbook III*, 39.

⁴⁶¹ Wesseliuss, "Language Play," 258.

⁴⁶² Parker, "Appeals for Military Intervention," 216.

of ʾAšur, who served the universal and omnipotent god ʾAšur. If Kilamuwa's relationship to the god ʾAšur included a coercive bond with contractual stipulations, Kilamuwa covered it up with his boasts of the resulting prosperity and peace in his own land. The Phoenician Kilamuwa granted official recognition to his local gods and implored their protection in guarding the inscription and the record of his compliance with the law of the king to bring prosperity and peace to the land.

The text portrayed the intervention of the god ʾAšur, who possessed universal, imperial jurisdiction and power over the local gods with local jurisdiction. The author(s) of this text did not stipulate obedience to the god(s) or the king but did imply such a relationship by acknowledgment of the intervention of the empire. Since the empire did not serve clients for free, Kilamuwa's rhetoric concealed large payments of tribute, taxes, and political and military submission. This text did not demand the projection of power and the destruction of foreign societies and their gods by force or by other means of intimidation. Kilamuwa's recognition of Assyrian intervention, however, presupposed the projection of imperial power by military means. The text does not stipulate punishment by death or exile for rebellion against the god or the servant or the spokesperson of the god but did record the destruction of neighboring political entities that had threatened a client and willing subject of the empire.

The text expresses a concept of justice that allowed for the destruction of enemies by imperial intervention in the interests of domestic peace. Thus the king could claim to have succeeded in achieving the prosperity for the land that his predecessors had failed to achieve. Such prosperity constituted justice for the land. The text reflected Kilamuwa's actual historical lack of political and military means for administering his own state and achieving his own claims. He admits to having relied on the imperial power for the achievement of justice and prosperity in his land. Thus he maintained his own identity as a Phoenician king while acknowledging the power of the empire. Kilamuwa's inscription depicted power as a means of achieving domestic prosperity and justice. He declined to record the cost of imperial intervention and stressed the stability of the markets and prosperity of the land. This publication revealed his sense of real politics and concern for his own land at the cost of the destruction of his competitors.

6.4. *Inscription of Zakkur of Ḥamat*

The stela of Zakkur, king of Ḥamat, found at a site called Āfis twenty-five miles southeast of Aleppo (in northeast Syria), contains a historical inscription that dates from 790–775 B.C.E.⁴⁶³ It describes a war initiated by Barha-

⁴⁶³ KAI 202; ANET 501–2.

dad of Aram, who united seven kings, including the king of Sam'al, to raise a siege against Zakkur. Zakkur appealed to his god, Ba'alšamayn, who then destroyed the army of Barhadad's coalition and allowed Zakkur to expand his district and to build strongholds and shrines to the gods within his borders, as follows:

A. (1) [n]šb' zy šm zkr mlk[h]mt w-l's l-lwr[mr'h] (2) ... [']nh zkr mlk hmt w-l's š' nh 'nh w-[(3) n]y b'lšmyn w-qm 'my w-hmlkny b'lšm[yn 'l] (4) [h]zrk w-hw'hd 'ly brhdd br hz'l mlk 'rm š[] (5) [] 'sr mlkn brhdd w-m'hnt-h ... (7) ... w-mlk šm'l m[hnt]-h ... (9) ... kl mlky' 'l mšr 'l hzr[k] (10) whrmw šr mn šr hzrk w-h'mqw hrš mn hr[šh] (11) w-'š' ydy 'l b'lš[my]n w-y'nyy b'lšmy[n w-yd(12)br] b'lšmyn 'ly [b]yd hzyn w-b-yd 'ddn[w-y'mr '(13)ly]b'lšmyn 'l tzhl ky 'nh hml[kt-k w-'nh] (14) [']m 'm-k w-'nh 'hšl-k mn kl [mlky' 'l zy] (15) m'h'w 'ly-k mšr

B. (3) ... 'n(4)[h bny]t hzrk w-hwsp(5)[t lh] 'yt kl m'hnt (6) [] 'w-šmt-h ml[] (7) [] t-h 'l (8) [] hšny' 'l bkl gb[] (9) [b]nyt bt-y 'lhn b[-kl '(10)r-q-ly w-bnyt 'yt [] (11) [] 'yt 'p's w[] (12) [] y' byt [] (13) [w]-šmt qdm['l(14)wr]nšb' znh w-k[tb(15)t b]h 'yt 'šr ydy [] (16) [m]n yhg' 'yt š[r] (17) [ydy] zkr... (23) [b'lšmyn w-'l(24)wr [] w-šmš w-šhr (25) [] w-'lhy šmy[n (26) w-'lh]y 'rq w-b'l 'l (27) [] š' w-'yt (28) [] š[] šh.

A. (1) The stele that Zakkur, king of Ḥamat and Lu'aš, set up for 'Iluwer, his lord. (2) I am Zakkur, king of Ḥamat and Lu'aš. A humble man am I, (3) and Ba'alšamayn delivered me and made me king (4) of Ḥazrak. Then Barhadad, son of Ḥaza'el, king of 'Aram, organized against me an alliance of (5) [six]teen kings—Barhadad and his army, ... the king of Sam'al and his army ... (9) ... All these kings laid a siege upon Ḥazrak. (10) They raised up a wall higher than the wall of Ḥazrak and dug a moat deeper than its moat. (11) But I lifted up my hands to Ba'alšamayn, and Ba'alšamayn answered me, and Ba'alšamayn spoke (12) to me through seers and witnesses. And Ba'alšamayn [said (13) to me], "Fear not, because I made you king, and I (14) shall stand with you, and I shall deliver you from all these kings, who (15) have laid upon you a siege."

B. (3 I 4) I rebuilt Ḥazrak and added (5) to it a whole circle of (6) [strongholds]. I established it as my kingdom (7) [and established it as my land. I built (8) all] these strongholds throughout my whole territory, (9) and I built temples for gods throughout (10) my whole land. Then I rebuilt ... and [] (11) [] 'Apiš. I settled [(12) the gods in the temple of 'Iluwer (13) in 'Apiš.] I have set up (14) this stele before 'Iluwer and [written (15) on] it the work of my hands. [(16) Wh]soever erases [the (17) work of the hands of] Zakkur king of Ḥamat and Lu'aš from this stele ... (23) let Ba'alšamayn and 'Iluwer

and Šamaš and ŠĤR [] and the gods of the heavens (26) and the gods of the earth and the lord of [] ... (28) [] ... his root.

Zakkur's rise to power coincided with the retreat of the Assyrian army from Syria after it had defeated Damascus and its coalition of states, and his inscription focused on war and his conflict with his neighbors. The coalition of [six]teen kings, which included those of Aram and Sam'al, resisted the expansion of Zakkur and set a boundary for him at Ḥazrak. Seers and diviners/witnesses (*ddn*) counseled Zakkur: "Do not fear!" This counsel recalls that of the Assyrian *raggintu* recorded later in Aššurbanipal's Prism B: *in-ḫe-ia šu-nu-ḫu-u-ti* ^d15 *iš-me-e-ma la ta-pal-laḫ ... ar-ta-ši re-e-mu* (Ištar heard my desperate sighs and said, "Fear not! ... I have mercy upon you").⁴⁶⁴ The Canaanite and Phoenician god Ba'alšamayn, who had delivered Ḥazrak, then destroyed those kings, who had attempted to resist Zakkur. Zakkur thereby expanded his land holdings and built fortresses around his borders and temples for the gods around his land. The inscription commemorated Zakkur's imposition of his authority and possession of the land under the auspices of the god Ba'alšamayn. Zakkur attributed his military success to his religious piety to his local gods Ba'alšamayn and 'Iluwer, who also possessed imperial international power of conquest.

In contrast to the inscriptions of Sefire, which presuppose two kingdoms of unequal strength in contractual relationship, Zakkur asserted his religious and military superiority over his sixteen neighboring kingdoms and did not want to make contracts, treaties, or *'adê* stipulations with his neighbors. Although not a treaty, his inscription expressed no interest in mutual cooperation with regard to maintaining the peace, the tranquility, the safe conduct of ambassadors and businessmen, military protection, protection from rumor and threats, the safety of a threat of retaliation against mutual enemies, and the reciprocal return of fugitives. Zakkur focused instead on his military might to impose order under the authority of the gods Ba'alšamayn and 'Iluwer. He took advice and encouragement from his seers and diviners. He conquered his neighbors' land, made it his possession under his authority and jurisdiction, and established shrines for his gods and fortresses around his borders. Zakkur served his national and imperial gods, Ba'alšamayn and 'Iluwer, as a military conqueror and expander of his land and borders. When his neighbors resisted his aggression, his gods, Ba'alšamayn and 'Iluwer, conquered them.

The scribes of Zakkur's text defined an imperial relationship between the god and the king and his victims. The author(s), as the representatives of the king, presented him as a humble servant of a powerful local god, who could conquer challengers. In this case the law constituted the command of the god

⁴⁶⁴ Aššurbanipal's Prism B (v 77–vi 16) in Nissinen, *References to Prophecy*, 44.

to conquer the enemies of the state, and the diviners expressed the support and encouragement of the god. Zakkur's text portrayed a king in humble service and obedience to the military law commanded by a single god although a second god, and others, played a minor supportive role. The text described the overwhelming power of Zakkur's single imperial and conquering god, who possessed his conquered nations and exercised jurisdiction over them. Zakkur's text demanded the projection of power and the destruction of foreign societies and their gods by force or by other means of intimidation. Zakkur's concept of justice stipulated vengeance by conquest of the god and imposition of the god's authority for the offence of threatening a more powerful neighbor. Zakkur's text may reflect his actual historical means for administering his claims, authority, and stipulations. Zakkur used his power, which he derived from his god, to counterattack his enemies although the claim of an intended assault could just represent a propagandistic excuse for planned aggression. Zakkur's inscription thus provides evidence of a small Levantine state that had assimilated at least the concepts of imperial aggression and had resorted to conquering its neighbors instead of contracting with them for co-operation in business and mutual defense.

6.5. *Inscription of Panammuwa I of Ya'udi for the Hadad Statue*

In the first half of the eighth century B.C.E., king Panammuwa I of the city-kingdom of Yady in southeastern Anatolia (780–743 B.C.E.) erected a statue with an inscription to the god Hadad a little to the northeast of the site of Zinjirli.⁴⁶⁵ The scribes used a dialect of Samalian Aramaic.⁴⁶⁶ This long inscription contains parts relevant to the discussion about the relationships of the gods to the king and the people, as follows:

(1) *ʾnk pnmw br qrl mlk Yaʾudi zy hqmt nšb zn lhdd bʾlmy* (2) *qmw ʾmy ʾlhw hdd wʾl w-ršp w-rkbʾl w-šmš w-ntn b-ydy hdd w-ʾl* (3) *w-rkbʾl w-šmš w-ršp ḥṭr ḥlbbh w-qm ʾmy ršp pmz ʾḥz* (4) ... *wmz ʾšʾl m]n ʾlhy ytnw ly. ...* (6) [*ʾrq ḥty wʾrq šmy ...* (8) ... *yšbt ʾl mšb ʾby ...* (10) *w-b-ymy ytmrb-[kl ʾr]qy l-nšb qyrt w-l-nšb zrry w-l-bny kpyry ḥlbbh [--]yqh* (11) ... *w-ʾmn -kʾt* (12) *by ... w-mh ʾšʾl mn ʾlhy mt ytr* (13) *ly ...* (19) ... *w-hwšbt bh ʾlhy w-b-ḥlbbth ḥnʾt ...* (20) ... *bny yʾḥz ḥṭr w-yšb ʾl mšby mlk* (21) *ʾl Yaʾudi w-ysʿd ʾbrw w-yzbh [hdd zn wzyk]r ʾšm pnmw yʾmr ʾkl nšb pnmw* (22) *ʾm hdd wyšty nšb pnmw ʾm hdd.*⁴⁶⁷

(1) I am Panammuwa, the son of Qrl, the king of Ya'udi, that I have raised this statue to Hadad for my posterity. (2) The gods Hadad and

⁴⁶⁵ KAI 214.

⁴⁶⁶ COS 2, 156.

⁴⁶⁷ KAI 214.

ʾIlu and Rašapu and Rakabʾilu and Šamaš stood with me, and they gave into my hands—Hadad, ʾIlu, (3) Rakabʾilu and Šamaš and Rašapu—the scepter in its midst, and Rašapu raised with me the staff of prosperity. (4) ... Whatever I asked of the gods, they gave to me. ... (6) [a]land of wheat and a land of garlic. ... (8) ... I sat on my father's throne. ... (10) In my days, he will rise up straight in(?)⁴⁶⁸ ... all my land to restore the town and to restore my scattered ones(?)⁴⁶⁹ and for the people of denial(?)⁴⁷⁰ his fat(?)⁴⁷¹ he will take prosperity. ... (11) And they [the gods] gave greatness (12) to me. ... And whatever I asked from the gods, they gave in excess (13) to me. ... (19) I settled my gods in it, and in its midst I rested. ... (20) Whoever of my sons takes the scepter and sits on my throne as king (21) over Yaʾudī and maintains power and makes sacrifice to Hadad and memorializes the name of Panammuwa and says: "May the soul of Panammuwa eat with Hadad and may the soul of Panammuwa drink with Hadad."⁴⁷²

At the time of this inscription, Syria enjoyed freedom from Assyrian interference, and the local orientation of the inscription reflects Panammuwa's independence and the lack of pressure from outside. Except for its use of a local form of Sidonian Caananite mixed with Aramaic, the lingua franca of the Assyrian empire, which may indicate some cultural influence from the quiescent empire of the period, the inscription reveals concern by the scribes and the king for local affairs and local gods. In the absence of Assyrian imperial influence, the king of Yaʾudī demanded that his offspring make offerings to Hadad to ensure the well-being of Panammuwa and the kingdom. The inscription bears no obvious military concerns for warfare, conquest, obedience, or punishment. Panammuwa I commemorated his independence by a deliberate exclusion of any mention of the encroaching Assyrian empire.⁴⁷³

The scribe of this text defined a peaceful relationship between the gods, the king, and the people. The god and the king cut a lasting agreement (*krt ʾmn*; Canaanite expression) for the prosperity and security of the kingdom in return for sacrifices and a dwelling place for the god Hadad. The author(s) and scribe(s) of the text thus served as the special representatives and spokespersons of that king and the god(s) in the public displaying and defining of this agreement as law and in the guaranteeing of its maintenance. The law

⁴⁶⁸ Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, 1678.

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid., 415.

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid., 659.

⁴⁷¹ Ibid., 464.

⁴⁷² Tropper, *Die Inschriften von Zinjirli*, 54.

⁴⁷³ Hamilton, "Past as Destiny," 225–26.

of the land in this case constituted the king's duty to secure peaceful succession to the throne, to sacrifice to the gods, to build defensive fortifications and centers, and to guarantee crops and prosperity.

The king in this text did not owe obedience to a single law demanded by a single god but rather had multiple tasks to several local gods, who represented the several facets of peaceful rule. No single god in this inscription had universal omnipotence or demanded a unilateral coercive bond with contractual stipulations; instead, the gods Hadad and 'Ilu and Rašapu and Rakab'ilu and Šamaš stood with Panammuwa. The inscription did not stipulate absolute obedience to the commands of the gods but instead instilled a sense of reciprocity between the authority of the gods and the duties of the people. This text did not demand the projection of power and the destruction of foreign societies and their gods by force or by other means of intimidation. This text did not stipulate punishment by death or exile for rebellion against the god or the servant or the spokesperson of the god but instead proposed a means of trial by a peer group of citizens for alleged infractions of the peaceful order. This text had a concept of justice in which the gods had expectations of sacrifices and dwelling places and the king performed his duties with the expectation of peace, prosperity, and smooth succession for his son to the throne. The text reflected a plausible and actual historical sense of characters capable of administering their claims and their stipulations. The text of Panammuwa differed from imperial texts in its depiction of power and how to use it. Panammuwa and his scribes focused their attention on the local gods, politics, and people. The local Levantine god Hadad did not command Panammuwa to destroy his neighbors and to take their land.

6.6. *Inscriptions of Mati^{el} of 'Arpad and Barga'yah of Ktk (Sefire)*

The incomplete treaty between the powerful king Barga'yah of Ktk and the less powerful but independent king Mati^{el} of Arpad comes from Sefire in the region of the upper Euphrates southeast of Ya'udī/Sam'al and dates to ca. 754 B.C.E. during the reign of Aššurnirari V of Assyria.⁴⁷⁴ The witnesses in the present inscription between Barga'yah and Mati^{el} consisted of "all the gods of Ktk and the gods of 'Arpad." The structure of the document followed that of Assyrian treaties of the early first millennium—introduction, list of gods, threats, and stipulations—as follows:

A (1) 'dy br g'yh mlk ktk 'm mt^{el} ... mlk 'rpd ... w-^c (2) dy bny br g'yh 'm bny mt^{el} ... (4) ... w-'dy b'ly ktk 'm 'dy b'ly 'rpd ... (6) w-nšb' 'm spr' z (7) nh šmw 'dy' 'ln w-'dy' 'ln zt g'zr br g'yh [qdm 'šr] (8) w-mlš w-qdm mrdk w-zrpnt w-qdm nb' ... (12) šhdn kl 'lhy ktk

⁴⁷⁴ Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, 19–20.

w-^lhy ʾr (13) *pd* ... (14) w-*hn* yšqr *mt*^{ol} l-br g^ʿyh ... (25) *thwy mlkth kmlkt hl mlkt hl mzy ymlk ʾšr ysk* (26) *hdd kl mh l-ḥyh b-ʾrq w-b-šmyn* ... (40) *ygZR ʿglʾ znh kn ygZR mt*^{ol}. ...

B (5) *l-ʿadê ʾlhy ktk ʿm ʿadê* (6) *ʾelohê ʾrpd.* ... (21) w-l-yšm^ʿ *mt*^{ol} ... (23) *šqrtm l-kl ʾelohê ʿdyʾ zh b-sprʾ znh.* (24) *tšmʿn w-tšlm ʿdyʾ ʾln w-tʾmr gbr ʿdn hʾ [ʾnh]* ... (28) w-*hn* y^ʾnh *ḥd mlkn w-ysbny yʾth ḥylk ʾly.* ... (32) w-*tm l-tʾwn b-hylkm l-šgb byty* ... (33) *šqrt l-ʾelohê ʿdyʾ zh.*⁴⁷⁵

A (1) Treaty stipulations of Bargaʾyah, king of Ktk, with Mati^{ol}el, ... king of Arpad. ... and (2) the treaty the sons of Bargaʾyah with the sons of Mati^{ol}el ... (4) and the treaty of the lords of Ktk with the lords of ʾArpad ... And the stele with this inscription (7) they placed these treaty stipulations. Now Bargaʾyah cut this treaty (8) [in the presence of ʾAšur] and Miš, and in the presence of Marduk and Zrpnt, and in the presence of Nabū ... (12) Witnessing: all the gods of Ktk and all the gods of ʾAr (13) *pad* ... (14) If Mati^{ol}el deceives Bargaʾyah, ... (25) may his kingdom become like a kingdom of sand, a kingdom of sand. As long as ʾAšur rules, may Hadad (26) pour out all kinds of evil on the earth and the heavens. ... (40) As this calf is cut up, so may Mati^{ol}el be cut up. ...

B (5) The treaty of the gods of Ktk with the treaty of the (6) gods of Arpad. ... (21) If Mati^{ol}el will not obey ... (23) you will have deceived all of the gods of the treaty in this inscription. (24) You will obey and carry out this treaty and say, “I am a strong man of the agreement.” ... (28) If one of the kings comes and surrounds me, your army must come to me. ... (32) If you do not come with your armies to strengthen my house, ... (33) you will have deceived the gods of the treaty.⁴⁷⁶

The god ʾAššur appeared in first place in the list followed by Marduk and then the gods of both cities. The threats did not include the standard Assyrian threat of extermination for disobedience but included some rather mild consequences in the form of natural disasters for deceitful actions. The inscription included a stipulation of obedience, but that concept of obedience constituted a request for the strength and cooperation of the contracting party rather than its submission.

In this inscription the relationship between the god Hadad and the participants in the treaty has an explicit contractual nature. The treaty made compliance with its stipulations compulsory under threat of punishment from the gods—ʾAššur, Marduk, and Hadad—who sponsored and witnessed the

⁴⁷⁵ Ibid., 19, 42, 43; *ANET* 503–4.

⁴⁷⁶ Translations mine but follow Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, 17–120.

agreement. Although the treaty acknowledged the hegemony of Aššur in the region, “as long as ʾAššur rules,” it did not enforce the rule of an imperial god of subjugation. It represented a more typical nonimperial Levantine arrangement in which two cities made promises under oaths and threats, such as “just as this calf is cut up, so may Matiʿel be cut up.” The isogloss “to cut a covenant” itself suggests a Western Semitic (Hebrew, Aramaic, Phoenician) provenance rather than an Eastern Semitic (Akkadian) expression, which “bound or established a covenant.”⁴⁷⁷

The treaty left Matiʿel’s office of king intact, and the notion of the treaty between gods of the two political entities suggested a treaty of mutual cooperation and support. The stipulation about the necessity to send an army indicates that the text represented a mutual defense pact between two states. Bargaʾyah made the demand for the support and appeared to have the upper hand but by no means imposed an imperial subjugation treaty along the lines of the later Assyrian annexations under Tiglath-pileser III. This text also stated that the god Hadad and the human participants acted in conformity with the larger community of “the gods of Ktk ... and the gods of Arpad.” No one god had preeminence in this worldview, but the many gods involved had agreed with Hadad in ratifying a political and military alliance between equivalent powers. In spite of the unfortunate cut-up calf, the consequences for disobeying Bargaʾyah and Hadad appear rather mild and did not include the “terrifying radiance” of overwhelming imperial threats of destruction, annihilation, deportation, and enslavement.

Does the Sefire treaty have real parallels in the Hittite and Assyrian treaties? Fitzmyer summed up the arguments of Korošec, Mendenhall and Moran, Wellhausen, and McCarthy to conclude that the Sefire treaties represent “vassal or suzerainty treaties.”⁴⁷⁸ His argument rests on the observation that the refugee clause of Hittite king Mursilis over Duppi-Tessub of Amurru parallels that of Sefire III:4–7: (4) *w-hn yqrq mny* (6) *w-thšbhm ly* (7) *šqttm b-ʿdyʾ ʾln* (If a fugitive flees from me ... you must return them to me). The use of the term “great king” also signifies a relationship of a vassal to an overlord. Terms for fugitives, however, characterized trade treaties between other small Levantine states and Hittite treaties interested in preserving lucrative local markets (such as Ugarit and Amurru) but did not characterize Assyrian subjugation treaties.

Fitzmyer then contrasts the treaties of Sefire to the so-called parity treaty between Ramses II and Hattušili III, but such a contrast does not constitute a valid analogy because a treaty between two warring empires from the second-millennium B.C.E. does not parallel the local Aramaic situation in Sefire. More appropriate parallels occur in the earlier local agreements between the

⁴⁷⁷ Tadmor, “Treaty and Oath,” 137.

⁴⁷⁸ Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, 136–66.

Levantine political entities Ugarit, Amurru, and Phoenicia of second-millennium B.C.E. Sefire, therefore, does not represent a subjugation treaty. It contains no threat of annihilation, deportation, murder of inhabitants, demand for tribute or taxes, no imposition of military occupation, no conquest, no law of conquest, no possession or annexation of the other kingdom's land, people, or goods. Nor does it reveal an imperial universal god in charge of the arrangement but instead an arrangement that includes the important gods including those of the dominant empire and their scribes. Inscriptions do not tell the whole story, but this one indicates a nonimperial Levantine agreement between neighbors of unequal strength for mutual support and military protection with conventional threats of retaliation for noncompliance.

Sefire II repeated some of the problems that would occur to Mati^{el}, if he would act against *'dy' w-ṭbr' zy 'bdw 'lhn b-ṛpd w-b-'mh* (the treaty and the amity which the gods have made in 'Arpad and among its people). It emphasized, however, the connection between obedience and peace, as follows:

- (4) *p-hn tšm' nḥt ...* (5) *hn t'mr b-nbš-k w-t'st b-lbb-k gbr 'dn 'nh w-šm' l-br g'yh* (6) *... p-l-'khl l-šlh yd b-k*
 (4) If you obey, tranquility ... (5) If you say in your soul and think in your mind, 'I am a strong man of the agreement, and I shall obey Barga'yah,' ... (6) then I shall not be able to raise a hand against you.⁴⁷⁹

The following Sefire III treaty, however, introduced some new themes that resembled the interstate treaty of Ugarit and its trading neighbor Amurru. Barga'yah contracted for the surrender of fugitives and any disloyal person, as illustrated in the following passage:

- (1) *... kl gb(2)r zy yb'h 'pwh w-ymll mln lḥyt l'ly [t l]tqh mly' mn ydh hskr thskrh m b-ydy* (4) *... w-hn yqrq mny qrq ...* (6) *w-thšbhm ly* (8) *w-šlh ml'ky 'lwh l-šlm 'wl-kl ḥpšy 'w yšlh ml'kh 'ly* (9) *ptḥh ly 'th' ...* (11) *hn 'yty yqtl n 't t'th w-tqm dmy mn yd šn'y. ...* (14) *w-hn ysq 'l lbb-k w-tš' 'l š* (15) *pty-k l-hmtty ...* (16) *šqrtm lk(17)l 'lhy 'dy' zy b-spr' znh* (17) *w-hn yrb bry zy yšb 'l khs'y 'm ḥd 'ḥwh ... l-tšlh* (18) *lšn-k bnyhm ...* (19) *... w-yqrq qrqy 'l ḥdhm w-yqrq qr ...* (20) *qhm w-y'th 'ly ḥšb zy ly 'ḥšb lh ...* (20) *w-hn l-hn šqrt b-'dy' 'ln*.⁴⁸⁰
 (1) Every man (2) who rants and utters evil words against me, [you] must [not] accept such words. You must hand them over to me). (4) If a fugitive flees from me ... (6) return them to me. ... (8) When I

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid., 122–23; Sefire II, B, 4–6.

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid., 139–41; Sefire III: 1–20.

send my ambassador to him for peace or for any of my business, or he sends his ambassador to me, (9) the road shall be open to me. ... (11) If they kill me, you must come and avenge my blood from the hand of my enemies. ... (14) If the idea should come to you, and you should express with your lips (15) to kill me, ... (16) you are deceitful to (17) all the gods of this treaty in this document. (17) If my son, who sits on the throne, quarrels with his brother ... you will not interfere. ... (19) If a fugitive of mine flees ... and a fugitive of theirs flees, ... (20) if he has restored mine, I shall return his. If you do not do so, you will act deceitfully against the treaty.

Barga'yah stipulated the return of fugitives from the contracted partner kingdom. He contracted for the freedom of passage for his ambassadors or ambassadors from other kings. He stipulated retaliation in case of his assassination. He stipulated that even the expression of an idea to kill him would constitute a breach of treaty. In case of an attempted coup, the treaty partner does not interfere with internal politics and struggles for the throne. The partner agrees to the reciprocal return of fugitives. Breach of these agreements constituted breach of the treaty.

Barga'yah enforced a contract with Mati^{el} for mutual cooperation with regard to maintaining the peace, the tranquility, the safe conduct of ambassadors and businessmen, military protection, protection from rumor and threats, the safety of a threat of retaliation against mutual enemies, and the reciprocal return of fugitives. Perhaps it did not differ much from the treaty that Aššur-nirari V imposed upon Mati'ilu of Arpad at the same time (755 B.C.E.) that stipulates Mati'ilu's obligation to return Assyrian fugitives and to provide military support to Assyria.⁴⁸¹

Yet neither of these treaties resembles the destructive and transforming annexation policy of Tiglath-pileser III. Typologizing arguments from ideal types like "suzerainty and parity" treaties do not clarify the issue. The Sefire inscriptions fit into the preimperial Levant provide evidence for the state of affairs before the destruction of that trade network by Tiglath-pileser III in 740 B.C.E. when he conquered 'Arpad and made it part of the Neo-Assyrian empire. The Sefire treaties also provide evidence of Levantine states that did not at least at first succumb to thorough assimilation into the Assyrian empire but did acknowledge the presence of the empire's principal gods. Tiglath-pileser III's policies of annexation and provincialization put an end to that state of affairs.

⁴⁸¹ Tadmor, "Treaty and Oath," 144

6.7. *Inscription of Azatiwada of Karatepe*

The mid-eighth-century-B.C.E. bilingual Phoenician and hieroglyphic Hittite building inscription of Azatiwada of Adana, discovered at Karatepe in south-central Turkey, occupies four sides of a statue of the god Ba'al.⁴⁸² The Phoenician text has three exemplars (A, B, and C). Text A appears on four orthostats and the base of a fifth at the entrance to the city of Karatepe. Azatiwada of Karatepe did not claim the office of king or governor per se but referred to himself as the blessed-one and the servant of the god Ba'al and the appointee of the king Awarku. Gibson suggests that this attitude reflected Azatiwada's independence just before the Assyrian aggression of 730 B.C.E.⁴⁸³ As a high official, Azatiwada supervised the rebuilding of the town of Karatepe and claimed credit for bringing peace, prosperity, and expansion to the land, as follows:

I (1) 'nk 'ztwd h-brk b'l 'bd (2) b'l 'š 'dr 'wrk mlk dnnym ... (4) ... yrhb 'nk 'rš 'mq 'dn l-mmš' š(5)mš ... (6)m w-šb' w-mn'm w-ml' 'nk 'qrt p'r w-p'(7)l 'nk ... w-mhnt 'l (8) mhnt b-'br b'l w-'lm w-šbrt mlšm. (9) w-trq 'nk kl h-r' 'š kn b-'rš ... (13) ... w-bn 'nk hmyt '(14)zt b-kl qšyt 'l gblm b-mqmm b-'š kn (15) 'šm r'm b'l 'gddm 'š bl 'š 'bd (16) kn l-bt mpš w-'nk 'ztwd štnm tbt p'm(17)y ... (18) ... w-'n 'nk 'ršt 'zt b-mb' (19) šmš 'š bl 'n kl h-mlkm 'š kn l-pny w-'(20)nk 'ztwd 'ntnm yrdm 'nk yšbm 'nk (21) b-qšt gbly b-mš' šmš w-dnnym
II (1) yšbt šm ... (2) ... l-mmš' šmš (3) w-'d mb'y ... (6) ... b-'br b'l w-'lm ... (9) ... w-bn 'nk h-qrt z w-št (10) 'nk šm 'ztwdy k b'l w-ršp- (11) šprm šlh'n l-bnt
III (2) ... w-brk b'l-krn(3)tryš 'yt 'ztwd hym w-šlm (4) w-'z 'dr 'l kl mlk.⁴⁸⁴

I (1) I am Azatiwada, the blessed of Ba'al, the servant of (2) Ba'al, whom Awrikku, king of the Danunites, made powerful. ... (4) I have expanded the country of the plain of Adana from the rising of sun to its setting. ... (6) I have filled the storehouses. I have added ... army to (8) army, because of Ba'al and the gods. I shattered the wicked. (9) I have removed all the evil that was in the country. ... (13) I have built strongholds in all the outposts at the borders where evil men were not submissive to the house of Mupšu. ... (18) I have subdued powerful countries (19) to the west, which the kings before me had not been able to subdue. ... (20) I have brought them down and settled them

⁴⁸² KAI 26; Green, *I Undertook Great Works*, 232.

⁴⁸³ Gibson, *Textbook III*, 41.

⁴⁸⁴ KAI 26; ANET 499–500.

II (1) at the eastern end of my borders and resettled Danunites there (in the west). ... (2) From the rising of the sun to its setting, ... (6) [peaceful activity] because of Ba'al and the gods. ... (9) I built this city and gave it the (10) name Azitawaddiya, for Ba'al and Rešep commanded me to build it.

III (2) May Ba'al-Krnrtryš (3) bless Azatiwada with life, peace, (4) and mighty power over every king.

The scribe of this text used trope after trope from the rhetoric of the Neo-Assyrian imperial inscriptions. The author began with a typical, traditional Assyrian-style introduction and his role as the “blessed of (the god) Ba'al, the servant of (the god) Ba'al.” This trope, for instance, echoed Aššurnasirpal II: “loved of gods Anu and Dagan, weapon of the great gods.”⁴⁸⁵ The king Azatiwada appeared to follow the same command from his god Ba'al that the imperial god Aššur made to his kings to expand his territory: “I have expanded the country of the plain of Adana from the rising of sun to its setting ... because of Ba'al and the gods.” Azatiwada followed Assyrian military practice by filling regional storehouses to supply his growing army. He disposed of the evil men, who did not submit to the house of Mupšu. Not submitting to the local ruler of Adana, of the house of Mupšu, constituted as much of a crime as the refusal to submit to Aššur in the Assyrian empire. Azatiwada, in classic Tiglath-pileser III fashion, transported insubordinate people from the west across his territory and replaced them with more compliant settlers from the east. He built his peaceful city because the gods Ba'al and Rešep commanded him to build it. He wished for more imperial power over kings.

The Phoenician inscription of Azatiwada of Karatepe, according to K. Lawson Younger, represents a sophisticated, literary, west Semitic royal inscription made for the purpose of legitimating and immortalizing Azatiwada.⁴⁸⁶ Thus the blessed Azatiwada attained religious empowerment by serving the god Ba'al and by making promises and threats by means of the creator god 'Ilu and the eternal god Šamaš. Azatiwada established his importance by boasting of his success in shattering the dissidents, building fortresses, filling the granaries, and establishing cultic innovations by the grace of Ba'al. He established economic and military power, security, and building activity, and brought his country into a state of *rš't* (root *r's* abundance and prosperity).

The text of Azatiwada, according to Irene J. Winter, parallels the Assyrian sources in that Azatiwada initiated a building program, achieved military, political, and economic security, filled the storerooms, fortified the

⁴⁸⁵ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers I* (RIMA 2), 194–95. Aššurnasirpal II, A.O.101.20.

⁴⁸⁶ Younger, “Phoenician Inscription,” 11–48.

borders, and built a citadel in the city of Karatepe.⁴⁸⁷ Azatiwada's claim that he hired the king of Assyria to destroy the Danunians, who threatened his borders, reflected the approximate time period of Tiglath-pileser III. The claim that Azatiwada "conquered the lands of the west, which former kings had not conquered, and deported the captives from the west and settled them in the east" recorded Assyrian policy and the innovations of Tiglath-pileser III. Azatiwada's policies as recorded in the Karatepe inscription indicate an Assyrian perspective that he could have learned from Tiglath-pileser III or perhaps even from Sargon II.

Azatiwada's inscription reveals numerous other parallels to Assyrian inscriptions along the theme of extending the land. Besides being loved by the gods, Aššurnāṣirpal II boasted of the same accomplishments: "King not equaled ... heroic man ... king who makes those not submissive to him submit ... disperses all of his enemies ... conquers the lands ... captured hostages, claimed victory."⁴⁸⁸ Like the Assyrians, Azatiwada founded new rural villages and settled people deported from across his little empire in order to "pile up more grain than ever before."⁴⁸⁹ Like Tiglath-pileser III (746–727 B.C.E.), Azatiwada built up his army and used it to take action against his neighbors.⁴⁹⁰ He constructed a network of forts to serve his expansion into conquered areas and to facilitate agricultural production and the process of obeying the command of the god Ba'al to transform the territory by eliminating the evil and disobedient people.⁴⁹¹ Azatiwada's resettlement of destroyed cities and areas paralleled the Assyrian agricultural and economic policy to increase stable sources of food. He took over areas of uncultivated land in order to settle and develop it with deportees. Like the Assyrian kings, the servant Azatiwada made war by the command of the god Ba'al. He acted as the representative of the god to "crush the disobedients."⁴⁹² Azatiwada promulgated the Assyrian idea of peace as enforced order and obedience to the god, and the loss of peace amounted to rebellion, unrest, and insubordination. Peace and prosperity indicated that the gods approved of a responsible and effective king. Like the Mesopotamians, Azatiwada publicized his sense of justice as a paternal duty to bring prosperity to the conquered land.⁴⁹³ Like an Assyrian king, Azatiwada granted his favor to a ruler, who would submit to his authority.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁸⁷ Winter, "On the Problems of Karatepe," 115–51.

⁴⁸⁸ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers I* (RIMA 2), 194–95. Aššurnāṣirpal II, A.O.101.20.

⁴⁸⁹ Parker, "Garrisoning the Empire," 84 n. 39.

⁴⁹⁰ Malbran-Labat, *L'armée*, 59–60.

⁴⁹¹ Parker, "Garrisoning the Empire," 77–88.

⁴⁹² Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 13–17, 67–73.

⁴⁹³ Foster, "Water," 70.

⁴⁹⁴ Parpola and Watanabe. *Neo-Assyrian Treaties*, XIV–XVI.

Such an inscription suggests that Neo-Assyrian imperial prestige had spread across the ancient Near East by the mid-ninth to mid-eighth century B.C.E. before the Assyrian advance of 730 B.C.E. Certain minor differences appear in that Azatiwada did not claim to have a blood or creature relation to the god Ba'al. Like other minor kings of the land of Hatti, he served his own local god while recreating that god in the image of the imperial god. Azatiwada's actions presuppose an aggressive military god and government that punished unsubmitive offenders, but his tone appears milder and less predatory than a typical Neo-Assyrian emperor. Of course, Azatiwada controlled a much smaller area and could not have had real universal, imperial dreams too far beyond his borders. He lacked an imperial terrifying radiance but did not lack a smaller army with grandiose imperial ambitions.

Azatiwada's inscription followed superficial notions of empire, however, and suggested no awareness of the bureaucratic substructure and infrastructure of obedience and oath. He emulated but did not approach the vast military discipline and might that would sustain an empire across international borders. Azatiwada rather resembled a ruler of a small household, the "house of Mupšu," who had gained control of his small corner of the world and wanted to imitate the empire and to participate in its glory and prestige without understanding the mechanics or the social and political reality of empire. This inscription might have represented Azatiwada's way of informing his imperial overlords that he acted in compliance with their rules by taking command of his corner of the universe, except that he made no overt gestures to the Assyrian empire. Without knowing of the existence of the Assyrian empire, one might never have guessed from his independent attitude that he wrote in the context of an independent imperial power. Like the scribes from Tell Fakhariyah, the scribes of Azatiwada might have seen this as a strategy to appease the Assyrians while at the same time emulating them by asserting the power of their local god.

In doing so, however, Azatiwada recreated his local Levantine god in the image of the imperial god. This text defined the relationship between the god and the ruler as that of a servant king or at least active ruler, who obeyed the command of the god to extend the land of the kingdom. The author(s) of the text act as the special representatives of the god(s) in recording the king's compliance and obedience and thus serve to maintain the proper relationship between the god(s), the king, and the people. The command of the gods constituted the law of the land, which the king obeyed by means of his military actions. In this text, the author(s) describe the omnipotence of the local god, who commands the king to conquer and supports the king in his obedience to that command. The king has no scruples or compunctions about obeying the god and destroying the evil from the land. The text models the relationship of god to society as a commanding and coercive bond with contractual stipulations for obedience and compliance rather than on a natural familial bond. This text portrayed the god as internal to the land but possessing uni-

versal, imperial jurisdiction to attack and to destroy other gods with local jurisdiction. This text stipulated obedience to the command of the god to eliminate evil contention as the means to a peaceful and prosperous land free of contention.

The author(s) of this text demand, in the voice of the god, the projection of the god's power and the destruction of foreign, neighboring societies and their gods by military force or by other means of intimidation. The text stipulated punishment by death or exile for rebellion against the god. The concept of justice expressed by the text consists of the duty of the servant of the god to bring prosperity to the land by extending its borders and making the markets stable. Anyone who would interfere with that process would commit a crime against the peace and prosperity of the state. The text reflected the ruler's means to impose his power on a limited scale within his own country and had the actual means for administering the claims and stipulations of the god. In this text the king used his power to extend his jurisdiction over disobedient or uncooperative lands and peoples and to bring the peace and prosperity of the god to those neighboring lands and other gods regardless of their will.

6.8. *Barrākib of Sam'al: Inscription to Panammuwa II*

With the help of the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser III, Barrākib took the throne of Ya'udī of southeastern Anatolia and renamed the kingdom Sam'al (ca. 743–740 B.C.E.).⁴⁹⁵ In this votive inscription (733–727 B.C.E.), Barrākib extols the successes of his father, Panammuwa II, king of then Ya'udī, who had abandoned the independence of Panammuwa I and, like Kilamuwa, escaped the curse and the sword of a coup by appealing to Assyria. Panammuwa II had fought alongside Tiglath-pileser III in campaigns to the east, and later the Assyrian king set Panammuwa II's son Barrākib on the throne of Sam'al (ca. 732 B.C.E.). Barrākib's inscription illustrates—by contrast with the previous inscription of Panammuwa I to the god Hadad—the change in perspective, politics, and even culture that occurred in Sam'al under the influence of the Assyrian empire, as follows:

(1) *nšb zn šm brrkb l'bh l'pnmw br bršr mlk y'dy [... šb] šnt []ql ...*
'by pnmw b[šd]q (2) *'bh pl'twh 'lh y'dy mn š'ht'zh hwt bby't 'bwh*
wqm 'lh hdd [] ... (5) *h'rb b-byty wthrgw h'd bny w'gm hwy't h'rb b-*
'rq y'dy wh[] l' pnmw br qrl 'b [] 'by [...] (6) *... w-ybl 'by br[]* (7) *'d*
mlk 'šwr w-mlkh 'l byt 'bh w-hrg 'bn š'ht mn byt 'bh[] mn 'šr [] 'lh
'rq y'dy [] ... (9) *... w-hy'tbh mn qdmth ...* (10) *... w-b-ywmy 'by pnmw*
šm mt b'ly kpyry w-b'ly rkb w-hwšb 'by pnmw b-mš't mlky kbr []

⁴⁹⁵ Rosenthal, "Canaanite and Aramaic Inscriptions," 500.

ʔ(11)by lw bʔl ksp hʔ w-lw bʔl zhb b-ḥkmth w-b-ṣdqh py ʔhz b-knp
 mrʔh mlk ʔswr [] (12) ʔswr pḥy w-ʔhy Ydy w-ḥnʔh mrʔh mlk ʔswr ʔ
 mlky kbr brš[wrš] (13) bglgl mrʔh tgltpslr mlk ʔswr mḥnt tq[] mn
 mwqʔ šmš w-ʔd mʔrb w[mn] (14) rbʔrq w-bnt mwqʔ šmš ybl mʔrb w-
 bnt mʔrb ybl mw[qʔ š]mš wʔby [] (15) gblh mrʔh tgltpslr mlk ʔswr
 qyrt mn gbwl grgm [] ... (19) ... w-ʔnk b[r]kb br pnm[w b-ṣd]q ʔby
 w-b-ṣdqy hwšbny mrʔy [] (22) w-zkr znh hʔ pʔ hdd w-ʔl w-rkbʔl bʔl
 byt w-šmš w-kl ʔhy Ydy [] (23) qdm ʔhy w-qdm ʔnš⁴⁹⁶

(1) Barrākib has set up this statue for his father Panammuwa, son of Brṣr, king of Yaʕudī ... the year of [] ... my father Panammuwa. By the justice of (2) his father, the gods of Yaʕudī saved him from the destruction that had happened in the house of his father. There arose the god Hadad [] (5) the sword against my household and killed one of my sons; so have I also unleashed the sword in the land of Yaʕudī [...] (6) ... Then my father brought [...] (7) to the king of ʔAšūr, and he made him king over his father's house and killed the stone of destruction from his father's house ... from the treasure of the gods of Yaʕudī []. (9) ... And he made it better than it was before. ... (10) In the days of my father Panammuwa, he always appointed commanders of the villages and commanders of the chariots. He gave my father Panammuwa a place among the powerful kings [...] (11) my father possessed silver and gold. Because of his wisdom and loyalty, he grasped the hem of his lord, the king of ʔAšūr, [...] (12) the governor of Ašūr, and the relatives of Yaʕudī. His lord, the king of ʔAšūr, let him rest, more than the powerful kings [and he ran] (13) at the wheels of his lord Tiglath-pileser [III], the king of Ašūr, in with the armies from the rising of the sun to the setting and [from] (14) the four regions of the world. The daughters of the east he brought to the west, and the daughters of the west, he brought to the east ... (15) To his territory, the lord Tiglath-pileser [added] towns from the region of Grgm ... (19) As for me, Barrākib, son of Panammuwa, because of the loyalty of my father and my own loyalty, my lord [set me up on the throne]. ... (22) And this memorial, may Hadad and ʔIlu and Rakib-ʔIlu, lord of the dynasty, and Šamaš and all the gods of Yaʕudī [] (23) before the gods and before the people.

Thus Barrākib described a local, historical situation that involved a sword and the destructions from which his father, Panammuwa II, extricated himself by enlisting the help of Tiglath-pileser III. By means of superior power, the king of ʔAšūr (*mlk ʔswr*) had made the nation better by installing Panam-

⁴⁹⁶ KAI 215.

muwa II as king of Ya'udî. Panammuwa II's life then resembled that of an Assyrian provincial governor (*šwr p̄hy* the governor of Ašûr), who would appoint the local commanders of the villages that functioned as supply centers for the Assyrian army⁴⁹⁷ and the commanders of the chariots that functioned as the primary source of military advantage for the Assyrian army.⁴⁹⁸ He received imperial authority and wealth through his wise decision to grasp the hem of his lord (*mr'h*) Tiglath-pileser III's garment. He accompanied the Assyrian emperor on a campaign to the four corners of the earth and transported the "daughters" from one end of the empire to the other. While the identity of the "daughters" may remain uncertain, the passage indicates the Assyrian imperial practice of deportation and repopulation of slaves and prisoners that Tiglath-pileser III instituted on a large scale. The emperor added to Panammuwa II's lands and then set his son, Barrākib, the stated author of the inscription, on the throne to succeed him. At the end Barrākib remembered his local gods and the god of his dynasty, but his allegiance, loyalty, and service belonged to the king of 'Ašûr and to his new position as local imperial authority.

Like his father Panammuwa II, Barrākib owed his power and his place on the throne of Sam'al to Tiglath-pileser III, who had reconquered the north Syrian region by 737 B.C.E.⁴⁹⁹ Barrākib represented the Assyrian king as the just benefactor, who had restored the legitimate dynasty to the throne of Sam'al. Hamilton points out that the author(s) of the inscription—Barrākib and his scribes—focused at the end of the inscription on the ultimate destiny of Panammuwa as more than just a local dynastic king but also as an important part of the greater endeavor of the Assyrian empire. Panammuwa II had accompanied the emperor on his campaign and fought alongside Assyrian forces "from east to west in the four quarters" of the world.⁵⁰⁰ This inscription from Zinjirli/Sam'al illustrates a Levantine state that had accepted both Assyrian rule and the imperial cultural vision and worldview that the empire brought with it. In this vast and great imperial world, a powerful king, Tiglath-pileser III, under the command of a universal god, 'Aššur, had established peace and prosperity in regions, such as Zinjirli/Sam'al, that had lacked great leaders with great vision. Barrākib did not share his grandfather Panammuwa I's vision of local self-reliance and peaceful reign without international aggression.

This text defined the relationship between the gods and the people and their leaders through the depiction of the local ruler's relationship of submission to the emperor Tiglath-pileser III. Just as Tiglath-pileser III served the

⁴⁹⁷ Postgate, "Economic Structure," 197; Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 67–68; Parker, "Garrisoning," 77.

⁴⁹⁸ Eph'al, "On Warfare," 96–97.

⁴⁹⁹ Parker, "Appeals for Military Intervention," 218.

⁵⁰⁰ Hamilton, "Past as Destiny," 215–50.

imperial and universal god Aššur, so the same relationship applied to the subject king of Sam'al. Under Barrākib the law of Sam'al became the same law as that of the empire in which the command of the god to expand the empire constituted the law. Thus under the authority of Lord Tiglath-pileser III, Sam'al became a society of the peripheral empire predicated upon obedience to a single martial law commanded by a single god. Barrākib surrendered the authority of the several local gods under whom Panammuwa I had ruled and accepted the omnipotence of a single commander under the authority of a foreign god. Barrākib did not forget "Hadad and 'Ilu and Rakib-'Ilu, lord of the dynasty, and Šamaš and all the gods of Ya'udā," but his text puts those gods under the stable authority of a foreign military power, his lord Tiglath-pileser III, with contractual stipulations rather than on a natural reciprocal bond with the local gods, who had brought disorder.

The lord Tiglath-pileser III possessed universal, imperial jurisdiction as opposed to the local gods with local jurisdiction. Barrākib's text did not stipulate absolute obedience to the god(s) from the people and their leaders, but one can extrapolate such a relationship from the known policies of the Assyrian imperial mandate. The author(s) of this text shared in the imperial demand for the projection of power and the destruction of foreign societies and their gods by the overwhelming power of the imperial army. The author(s) of this text expressed no concept of justice beyond their servitude and loyalty to Lord Tiglath-pileser III. Barrākib's lack of concern for local justice suggested that he had at least in this inscription forgotten his grandfather's concern for local traditions and gods. Peace, prosperity, authority, and justice came from his lord the king of Ašur. Like his father, Panammuwa II, he would join the imperial army in its campaigns.

6.9. *Building Inscription of Barrākib of Sam'al*

Dressed in Assyrian garments in his image engraved at the top of this building inscription from the site of Zinjirli (733–727 B.C.E.), the king Barrākib of Sam'al repeats his acknowledgment of the generosity of his lord (my lord, *mr'y*) Tiglath-pileser III. Barrākib, as servant of Tiglath-pileser III (*'bd Tglt-plys*), extolled the benefits of submission, allegiance, and servitude to the empire, as the following excerpt illustrates:

(1) *'nh brkbb* (2) *... mlk śm* (3) *'l 'bd Tglt-plysr mr'* (4) *rb'y 'rq' b-šdq 'by w-b-šd* (5) *qy hšbny mr'y rkb'l* (6) *w-mr'y tigt-plysr 'l* (7) *krs' 'by w-byt 'by* (8) *'ml mn kl w-ršt b-glgl* (9) *mr'y mlk 'šwr b-mš't* (10) *mlkn rbrbn b'ly* (11) *ksp w-b'ly zhb w-'hzt* (12) *byt 'by w-hyṭbt-h* (13) *mn byt ḥd mlkn* (14) *rbrbn*.⁵⁰¹

⁵⁰¹ *KAI* 216.

(1) I am Barrākib ... (2) king of Sam'al, (3) servant of Tiglath-pileser, the lord of the (4) four quarters of the world. Because of my father's compliance and (5) my compliance, my lord Rakib-'Ilu and my lord (6) Tiglath-pileser established me on (7) the throne of my father. My father's house (8) has profited more than anyone else. I have run at the wheel of (9) my lord, the king of 'Ašūr, in the midst (10) of mighty kings, who possessed (11) silver and gold. I made (12) my father's house more prosperous (13) than the house of any one of the mighty kings.

Barrākib's city benefitted from the peace and prosperity of the Neo-Assyrian empire, which depended upon the loyalty, compliance, and submission of the king and his local dynastic god Rakib-'Ilu, and to the imperial lord, the king of 'Ašūr. Subjugation to the king of 'Ašūr, as the servant of the god, meant subjugation to the god Aššur. Such submission, however, did not entail suffering from the point of view of the author of the text. Instead it brought more wealth, peace, and prosperity than the mighty kings of previous times, who had resisted the empire, could bring.

Although this inscription did not mention the word *adê*, the compliant and satisfied tone of the writing may indicate that such a treaty and a public oath ceremony accompanied and governed the relationship because, according to Malbran-Labat, the *adê* (sworn commitment) bound the levels of society including subjugated nations to the king by a personal bond. An official of the palace (*ša pān ekalli*) would come with a royal guard and bring a sealed tablet from the king to hear the oath in the presence of the gods.⁵⁰² The tone of Barrākib's allegiance and submission suggested that he partook of the *adê* of submission, allegiance, prosperity, power, and emulation of the empire. Barrākib acknowledged the compliance and agreement of the local god, Rākib-'Ilu, as sharing in the prosperity.

Thus, as in Tell Fakhariyah, the king claimed to hold both the titles of local king and loyal subject of the empire. This arrangement suggests that the empire, or perhaps each individual emperor, had a flexible manner of dealing with its subjects in spite of the harsh and absolutist rhetoric of the royal inscriptions. The inscription, like that of Tell Fakhariyah, depicts the peaceful and profitable side of Aššur's imperial projection of power into the four corners from east to west.

With the exception of the inscription of Panammuwa I, who held onto local political and religious structures, the texts of the kings of Zinjirli—Kilamuwa, Panammuwa II, and Barrākib—illustrate the process of assimilation that small lands experienced under the power, influence, and prestige of the empire. Rather than have their kingdoms and their dynasties destroyed, the

⁵⁰² Malbran-Labat, *L'armée*, 35, 39.

local kings of Yaʿudī/Samʿal recorded for public record their compliance with the army of the Assyrians. They paid the taxes and tribute and accepted the wealth, peace, and prosperity that accompanied the Assyrian imperial worldview. In addition, they joined forces with the Assyrians in their grand plan to extend the empire to the four corners.

6.10. *Reactions to the Empire: Hypotheses*

This survey of the inscriptions of the Levant from the ninth and eighth centuries B.C.E. reveals that the Levantine states had various reactions to the Neo-Assyrian empire. With a rebellious wit, Haddu Yisʿi of Tell Fakhariyah accepted the peace, order, and prosperity of the empire. The scribe(s) of the Tell Fakhariyah text depicted the projection of Assyrian power as a benevolent force designed to improve local production, trade, and wealth. In their own language, however, their local god maintained his place of priority.

Mešaʿ of Moab emulated the power and prestige of the empire and adapted its imperial ideology to his local situation. The inscription of Mešaʿ of Moab relates the projection of the power of king Mešaʿ and his army as service to the god Kemoš in the destruction and domination of neighboring populations and their gods.

Kilamuwa of Yaʿudī/Zinjirli eliminated his competitors and brought prosperity to his land with the military and economic support the king of ʿAšur. Behind Kilamuwa’s Phoenician literary rhetoric about justice and prosperity, large payments of tribute, taxes, and political and military submission belied his emulation of the empire and his imitation of the imperial worldview and policies. Kilamuwa, however, did not recreate his local gods in the image of the imperial god.

The scribes of Zakkur of Ḥamat defined an imperial relationship between the god and the king in which the law constituted the command of the god to conquer the enemies of the state. Zakkur’s single omnipotent god possessed universal, imperial jurisdiction over the neighboring local gods, who had forfeited their local jurisdiction by defeat in war. Zakkur’s god demanded the projection of power and the destruction of foreign societies and their gods by military action. Zakkur’s inscription thus provides evidence of a small Levantine state that had assimilated the concepts of imperial aggression and had resorted to conquering its neighbors instead of contracting with them for cooperation in business and mutual defense.

Panammuwa I of Yaʿudī/Zinjirli ignored the empire, at least in his inscription, and trusted in (*krt ʾmn*) the local god Hadad for the prosperity and security of the kingdom. His concept of the law of the land included the king’s duty to secure peaceful succession to the throne, to sacrifice to the gods, to build defensive fortifications and centers, and to guarantee crops and fair trials for the citizens. This text promulgated a sense of legal reciprocity between the authority of the gods and the duties of the people.

Panammuwa and his scribes paid no apparent attention to the Assyrian empire and focused their attention on the local gods, politics, and people. The local Levantine god Hadad did not command Panammuwa to build an army, to destroy his neighbors, or to take an aggressive military action.

The Sefire inscriptions of Mati'el of 'Arpad and Barga'yah of Ktk (Sefire I, II, III) illustrated Levantine preimperial contracts for international cooperation in order to maintain peace, tranquility, safe conduct of ambassadors and businessmen, military protection, protection from rumor and threats, and the reciprocal return of fugitives. They provide evidence for the state of affairs just before the destruction of that trade network and the implementation of Tiglath-pileser III's policy of annexation in 740 B.C.E. The Sefire treaties also provide evidence of Levantine states that acknowledged the prestige of the empire's principal gods but did not succumb to assimilation into the Assyrian empire until conquered. Tiglath-pileser III's policy of annexation and provincialization put an end to that system of international trade treaties.

Azatiwada of Karatepe also emulated the power and prestige of the empire and adapted its imperial ideology to the local situation. The inscription of Azatiwada portrayed the god as internal to the land but possessing universal, imperial jurisdiction to attack and to destroy neighboring nations and gods. It stipulated obedience to the command of the god to eliminate evil contenders, who resisted a peaceful and prosperous land just like that of the empire.

King Barrākib of Sam'al reversed the local policies of his grandfather Panammuwa I. He followed the policy of Kilamuwa and that of his father Panammuwa II and submitted to the lord Tiglath-pileser III. The effective law of Sam'al thus became the martial law of the peripheral empire under the command of the local servant of the god Aššur. The new society accepted a coercive foreign bond with universal jurisdiction and an imperial mandate. The inscription suggests that Barrākib reflected an attitude of full compliance and assimilation to the rule of the empire, gave up self-government, and ignored the local god rather than try to recreate it in the imperial image.

Barrākib's building inscription, like the texts of the kings Kilamuwa and Panammuwa II, illustrated the process of full assimilation that small lands experienced during the three-century-long presence of the empire and its god. Rather than have his kingdom destroyed, Barrākib, like other Levantine kings (with the exception of Panamuwa I) complied with the army of the Assyrians. He paid the taxes and tribute and accepted the wealth, peace, prosperity, and ideology that accompanied the Assyrian imperial worldview. He joined forces with the Assyrians to extend the influence of the empire in their local regions.

Inscriptions cannot tell the whole story of history, but this evidence from the state-level records of the kings' relationships with the Neo-Assyrian empire reveals a majority tendency of Levantine cities and kingdoms to assimilate to the empire and to transform one's own god, society, and concept of

law into the peripheral imperial worldview. Of the eight inscriptions, one, that of Panammuwa, shows no apparent influence from the empire. Two inscriptions, Tell Fakhariya and Sefire, illustrate passive or peripheral acceptance of the empire. Five inscriptions—those of Meša^c, Kilamuwa, Zakkur, Azatiwada, and Barrakib—depict ideologies of imperial aggression. Of the minority states, Panammuwa I resisted its power, but his descendants gave in to it. The independent states of Mati^oel and Barga'yah, who nevertheless imitated imperial treaties, disappeared with the annexations of Tiglath-pileser III.

This study will go next to the doorstep of Levantine Jerusalem in those same centuries with the same question. How did the authors of the Deuteronomistic History, the *nēbî'im*, react and adapt to the empire?

CHAPTER 7: AŠŠUR COVENANT TO YHWH COVENANT

7.1. *Survey of the Scholarship*

Scholarship concerning the archaeology, history, and literature of Judah and Jerusalem of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. points to deep Assyrian involvement in the life and literature of the DH, which the DH does not acknowledge. This study now reviews that scholarship and proceeds to take a final look at key Neo-Assyrian imperial documents (ch. 5) and their presupposed ideology and to compare them to the key elements and presuppositions in the Dtr covenant (ch. 2).

7.1.1. Archaeology

Archaeological evidence from the city and environs of Jerusalem suggests, according to Steiner, that it appeared in the tenth century B.C.E. as a new town with a new foundation of large administrative buildings and some residential quarters.⁵⁰³ Jerusalem served as a small administrative center like Samaria and had a size of twelve hectares and a population of no more than 2,000 throughout the ninth century B.C.E. As in Megiddo, Hazor, Gezer, and Lachish of the ninth century B.C.E., the archaeology revealed fortifications and public buildings with Phoenician-style ashlar masonry. Jerusalem functioned as a fortress over a small regional state, but Steiner could not call the Jerusalem of the tenth and ninth centuries B.C.E. the capital of a monarchy.

Mazar's dig into the Ophel in Jerusalem supports Steiner's findings of Phoenician ashlar masonry and architecture of the tenth century B.C.E., except that Mazar uses "biblical descriptions of historical reality and detailed truth" to interpret the same facts as evidence of David's and Solomon's royal palaces and gates. The biblical description of Solomon's temple resembles the *bīt ḥilāni* temple of Phoenician Zinjirli.⁵⁰⁴ By means of the same evidence viewed from a regional Levantine perspective, Holladay's study confirms the establishment of Phoenician and Canaanite ashlar architecture, international economy, trade routes, and political organization in the fortress towns of Hazor, Gezer, Samaria, Megiddo, and Jerusalem in the tenth century B.C.E.⁵⁰⁵

After the destruction of Judah by Sennacherib in 701 B.C.E., according to Steiner, Jerusalem took on a more central role with a massive increase in population.⁵⁰⁶ This increase in population would have resulted, in the view

⁵⁰³ Steiner, "Jerusalem," 283.

⁵⁰⁴ Mazar, "Did I Find David's Palace?" 16–70; eadem, "What did David's Palace Look Like?"; eadem, "Royal Gateway to Ancient Jerusalem Uncovered."

⁵⁰⁵ Holladay, "Kingdoms of Israel and Judah," 371–72.

⁵⁰⁶ Steiner, "Jerusalem," 283.

of this present study, both from an influx of refugees from Samaria and Israel and from the resettlement of deportees from across the Assyrian empire, if Sennacherib had followed normal Assyrian policy of the period. By the seventh century B.C.E., the city took up fifty hectares, had a large elite residential quarter, a sophisticated water supply by tunnel, and 5–7 m thick walls. Imported goods implied evidence of trade with Syria, Cyprus, Assyria, and Egypt.

This evidence may mean that the Assyrian empire had incorporated and integrated the former Phoenician and Canaanite city into its imperial trade network. New settlements built in the seventh century B.C.E. consisted of typical Assyrian agricultural and industrial villages, fortresses, and palaces but no typical Canaanite towns, according to Steiner. Jerusalem had assumed the central imperial command of the region's economy, politics, and religion.⁵⁰⁷ Steiner does not attempt to write about the history behind the changes in the archaeology, but her observations remain consistent with the image of a growing Jerusalem as a subject state bursting with prosperous trade and foreign deportees from the Assyrian empire during its period of expansion and peace, the *Pax Assyriaca*, after Tiglath-pileser III.

Archaeology, according to Finkelstein, presents a real-time witness of the social, economic, and geopolitical realities of the period of the composition and compilation of the DH, which began in the eighth century B.C.E. with the integration of Judah into the world economy of the Assyrian empire.⁵⁰⁸ Archaeological evidence, according to Na'aman, can contribute to the understanding of the demography, economy, and culture of Judah and Israel in the wake of the Assyrian deportations of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E.⁵⁰⁹ Tiglath-pileser III (745–727 B.C.E.) conquered Israel in 734–732 B.C.E., annexed it to Assyria, and deported 13,520 people from the area. Annexation meant the subsequent installment of a replacement population. He created the Assyrian provinces of Galilee, Dor, and Gilead with immigrants from Assyria. Although he did not resettle the Galilee region, he made the city of Megiddo the capital of a province with a large Assyrian residence.

According to the Nimrud prism, Sargon II (721–705 B.C.E.) later captured and annexed Samaria, deported 27,280 of its people from the district of Samaria, and turned it into the Assyrian province of Samerina. Sargon II describes his deportations in the Nimrud Prism: "I repopulated Samerina more than before. ... I counted them as Assyrians." He replaced the population with deportees, Aramaeans and Chaldeans from Ur as well as people from the Zagros mountains, according to Na'aman, and rebuilt Samaria as the capital of the province.⁵¹⁰

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid., 284–85.

⁵⁰⁸ Finkelstein, "Digging for the Truth," 19–20.

⁵⁰⁹ Na'aman, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors*, 200–219.

⁵¹⁰ Ibid., 203.

After Sennacherib's Third Campaign, according to Kletter, the state of Judah remained restricted to a small area around Jerusalem until the reign of Josiah (639–609 B.C.E.).⁵¹¹ Despite the claims of the DH, Josiah's reforms did not extend beyond the traditional borders of Judah. Kletter's analysis suggests that even from the viewpoint of one who supports the existence of a Judahite state and minimalizes the influence of Assyria, the reformed Judah under the triumphant Josiah appears much reduced in size and scope in archaeology than one would anticipate from the DH account.

According to the DH (2 Kgs 17:24, 27–31), the Assyrian immigrants to the province Samerina came from Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath, and Sepharvaim and brought their gods with them.⁵¹² According to Younger, the people of Babylon brought the goddess Bānitu (creatress), and the people from Cuthah brought Nergal the Assyrian god of death, war, and the underworld. The people of Hamath might have come from Amate in Mesopotamia where they worshipped a god called Ashima. The gods Adrammelek and Anammelek remain unidentified although their names suggest a Phoenician origin.⁵¹³

Destructions, deportations, and ongoing repopulations of Israel and Judah by the Assyrians took place in 732, 722/721, and 701 B.C.E., according to Stern. Stern's evidence supports the textual data that Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II deported 40,800 people from Israel, that Sennacherib deported 200,150 from Judah, and that the Assyrians repopulated the regions with even more deportees. It reveals what the DH text does not tell—that the Assyrians brought in new inhabitants from Mesopotamia to repopulate reconstructed towns and that this process continued throughout the Assyrian period of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. A new state thus emerged during the *pax Assyriaca* of the seventh century B.C.E. that radiated outwards from the tiny polity of Jerusalem. This new state retained some of its local Phoenician and Canaanite character but appeared reconstructed and designed along the more centralized economic and political lines of the Assyrian infrastructure. Stern calls the Assyrian impact on Judahite culture “revolutionary” in the sense that it brought an end to the “age-old Israelite-Phoenician tradition and introduced the Mesopotamian-Assyrian one instead.” The new population rebuilt the area, brought prosperity, and “made it different from its predecessor.”⁵¹⁴ Although Stern presents just the physical changes in the landscape and the society that took place on the ground under the influence of the Neo-Assyrian Empire during the seventh century B.C.E., his archaeological analysis reminds one of Weinfeld's assessment of Josiah's “revolutionary” reform, which took place at the same time.

⁵¹¹ Kletter, “Pots and Politics,” 19–54.

⁵¹² Na'aman and Zadok, “Assyrian Deportations,” 159–88; *COS* 3:262–63.

⁵¹³ Younger, “Repopulation,” 274–75.

⁵¹⁴ Stern, *Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods*, 3, 8–10, 19, 132, 19.

Yet DH scholars could not explain either the provenance of the unifying political concept of Israel or how the great reformation of Josiah could give birth to a one-god religion. Finkelstein and Silberman maintain that Josiah's revolution represented the climax of Israel's monarchic history and the "greatest hope for national redemption ... to reform the fallen glories of the house of Israel."⁵¹⁵ Their archaeological analysis of the history of Israel, however, found no unambiguous evidence that would verify Josiah's reform. They could not explain the origin of a revolutionary imperial state in the hills of Canaan because they combined local archaeology with the information of the DH as real history. They did not consider the overwhelming political and religious influence of the dominant imperial power of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. with its one-god holy empire.

The Assyrian conquests of the late eighth century B.C.E., according to Mazar, caused major changes in the political and demographic structure of the country by dividing Canaan into those several Assyrian administrative provinces.⁵¹⁶ The archaeological evidence that Mazar collected reflects the same massive Assyrian presence in this region. It confirms Stern's description of the dramatic way in which the Assyrians conquered Samaria and Judah and documented their conquests in texts, monumental reliefs, and memorial stele.

A DH author living in Jerusalem in the late eighth century B.C.E., according to Na'aman, composed the district list of Solomon (1 Kgs 4:7–19) following the Assyrian provincial system of his time.⁵¹⁷ Na'aman's observation suggests a correlation between the DH and the conditions of the seventh century B.C.E. It illustrates the propensity of the DH authors to create the past and to transform the conditions of their own period of defeat and subjugation into a glorious vision of the past. Likewise, the town list in Joshua 15—which divides the land into the administrative territories of Negeb, Shephelah, Hill, Wilderness, and Benjamin—coincides with the geographical divisions and the town list of Josiah's kingdom of Judah of the seventh century B.C.E. and suggests that the two lists had the same provenance.⁵¹⁸

The archaeological analyses of Stern, Mazar, and Na'aman confirm Sennacherib's account of the destruction of Judah and deportation of the population after which a small city with a few literate members of the Jerusalem ruling class survived. The subsequent building up of the area, accomplished by Assyrian deportees, followed the Assyrian pattern of fortresses guarding the imperial trade routes. Although the DH account of conquest and cult centralization in a holy city minimizes the influence of Assyria, it still reflects

⁵¹⁵ Finkelstein and Silberman, *Bible Unearthed*.

⁵¹⁶ Mazar, "Assyrian Conquests and Domination," 544–47.

⁵¹⁷ Na'aman, "Solomon's District List," 419–36.

⁵¹⁸ Idem, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors*, 330.

the imperial worldview and presuppositions of its contemporaneous overlords from that other distant holy city at the center of a dominant empire.

7.1.2. History

The Assyrian invasions changed the ancient near-eastern world. As Keel summarizes the history, in 738 B.C.E., Tiglath-pileser III launched a campaign to west Syria and annexed Israel and in 734 B.C.E. deported its population (2 Kgs 15:17–22, 29). Ahaz of Judah became a willing partner of the empire of Aššur, and exiles from the north fled to Judah. At the same time, a movement began among the exiled *nabî'im* of Israel against all manifestations of Phoenician-Canaanite cults and culture. Šalmaneser V launched a two-year siege that resulted in the destruction of the remnant kingdom of Israel, the deportation of 27,280 citizens, and the establishment of a new Assyrian province called Samerina. Sargon II created a new loyal and subservient population by bringing in deportees from across the empire to replace the deportees from Samerina. Jerusalem experienced a population growth from 2000 in the MB age to 26,000–50,000 by the end of the eighth century B.C.E., and its pottery assemblage changed from local Canaanite-Phoenician ware to Assyrian palace ware. The Israelite exiles to Judah thus brought, in addition to the new pottery and architecture, an array of new traditions, which included exclusive covenant to YHWH, cultic and political centralization, a policy/law of conquest and annexation, and the extermination of the Canaanite-Phoenician culture.⁵¹⁹

Hezekiah attempted to assimilate the new population and to implement the new political religion based on Assyrian principles of treaty and covenant by attacking and destroying the Phoenician-Canaanite religious sites and symbols. In 701 B.C.E., however, Sennacherib destroyed the towns of Judah (Josh 15:20–63), locked up Hezekiah in his city, terrorized him with the “terror of the radiance,” and took a huge increase of tribute, hostages, and deportees. Although Jerusalem, under Manasseh, submitted to the power of the empire of Aššur thereafter until its demise, DtrG interprets that period as one of triumph of YHWH over the Assyrian god.⁵²⁰ Keel’s analysis of the history of Jerusalem from this point on turns to an interpretation of the literature of DtrG.

Comparisons of the imperial inscriptions of the Assyrians with the DH, according to Na’aman, lead to questions of DH historical reliability.⁵²¹ Although Šalmaneser III fought a campaign in 853 B.C.E. in Qarqar against a coalition of Syrian states, which included Ahab of Israel and Adad-idri of Damascus, the DH account does not mention this struggle or anything about Assyria. The DH

⁵¹⁹ Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems*, 369, 377, 403, 409, 460.

⁵²⁰ Ibid.

⁵²¹ Na’aman, *Ancient Israel’s History and Historiography*, 198.

asserts instead that Israel and Damascus fought each other at that time. Šalmaneser III came again in 841 B.C.E. and received the tribute from Jehu the famous son of Ḥumri. Assyrians used the term *Bit Ḥumri*, after Jehu the king of the “house of Omri” (*āmārî*), to refer to Israel and Samaria.⁵²² The history of Jehu in the DH, however, does not mention Šalmaneser III. Where the Assyrian text depicts a defeated Jehu offering tribute to Šalmaneser III, the DH portrays a triumphant warrior removing Baal worship from Israel (2 Kgs 10:28) and suffering a few losses from his rival Aramaeans (2 Kgs 10:32–33).

According to the DH, Judah remained a loyal subject of Assyria from the time of the so-called Syro-Ephraimite war of 734–732 B.C.E., when Ahaz of Judah affirmed his loyalty to Tiglath-pileser III, until the rebellion of Hezekiah and the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 B.C.E.⁵²³ After the withdrawal of Sennacherib, the DH took a triumphal tone and did not acknowledge the ongoing presence of the Assyrians and the deportees. After the destruction of Judah, however, the city of Jerusalem remained in its subject status throughout the seventh century B.C.E. until the last days of the empire, despite the DH account of Josiah’s reform and empire.

In other words, no apparent rebellion or reform occurred during the *pax Assyriaca* when Assyrian governors, military, and deportees from the extremities of the empire moved in and took over the states of Judah and Jerusalem and Israel and Samaria. According to Sennacherib’s account of the Third Campaign, the Assyrians deported 200,150 inhabitants of the former state of Judah, and parceled the land itself out to loyal Assyrian governors. Sennacherib would have followed a deportation of such numbers with a reciprocal repopulation of the area with deportees from the extremities of the empire.

Despite these assertions and numbers, according to Smith, the Assyrian hegemony might have played no role in the politics of Jerusalem and the composition of the DH. Smith attributes the emergence of monotheistic statements to the changing social dynamics of the period in which the “theological intelligibility of a single god correlated well with the perspective of Judahite social structure at the end of the seventh century B.C.E.”⁵²⁴ He perceives the Jerusalemite society through the lens of the DH, however, and understands its covenantal relationship as a local evolutionary development that evolved out of the existing Levantine social and political structure. He characterizes Judah’s reaction to the empires of Aššur and Marduk as a shift to the cosmic status of the god but offers no explanation for that shift. What Smith calls cosmic, however, may mean imperial. Social dynamics, moreover, do not take place in a vacuum, and no intrinsic evolutionary logic demands a single cosmic god as the one prime mover.

⁵²² Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 39.

⁵²³ Machinist, “Administration of (Assyro-Babylonian) Palestine,” 74.

⁵²⁴ Smith, *Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 164, 165.

Scholars who follow the historical record of the DH as history accept that the state of Judah under the Assyrian hegemony went about its own business with no political or religious influence from its imperial master of two centuries. Assyria thus asserted the “principle of divine abandonment,” according to Cogan, in conquering their victims (2 Kgs 18:25), demanded political submission from them, and did not interfere in local cults.⁵²⁵ Yet how could native cults remain undisturbed when the Assyrians had transported the population across the empire and replaced them with foreigners from the extremities of the empire? According to Cogan, subjugated states, such as Jerusalem, had no cultic obligations, and Assyria demanded loyalty, the *adê* (oath), in political and economic matters alone. Cogan does not take into account, however, the removal of at least 200,250 people from Judah, which decimated, if not removed, the population and the local religion in the countryside.⁵²⁶ He overlooks the power of prestige that the dominant military and political power would have exerted on a tiny city like Jerusalem. He proposes that Hezekiah, Josiah, and the deuteronomistic school intended a religious reform motivated by “repentance and soul searching” for the people, such as Manasseh, who had forsaken the local god and abetted foreign ritual. His analysis follows the account of the DH and does not take into consideration the destruction and depopulation of the state nor the personal aspect of the dominant imperial military ideology. The present study hypothesizes that the so-called religious reform resembles not a return to archaic tribal simplicity but rather a strong rejection of the local Levantine Phoenician and Canaanite way of life and its gods in favor of a new universal religion inspired by the prestige and power of a dominant imperial, Mesopotamian god.

The triumphal rhetoric of Cross’s preexilic Dtr₁ in the seventh century B.C.E. Josianic period obfuscates a period of exile and isolation in which the subjugated DH authors found themselves isolated and defeated as strangers in their own country surrounded by Assyrian governors and their masses of deportees. This process of isolation would have begun with the initial conquests and deportations from Samaria and Israel in 732 B.C.E., the final conquest of Samaria in 721 B.C.E., the decimation and repopulation of Judah in 701 B.C.E., and the subjugation throughout the seventh century B.C.E. Weinfeld considers this period one of exile and defeat for the inhabitants of Israel and Samaria,⁵²⁷ and this present study proposes to refer to this period as Exile₁ because it applies as well to the inhabitants of Jerusalem after the destructions of Israel and Samaria and Judah. During this period, Jerusalem served as a central imperial city for the collecting of taxes and tribute in the local

⁵²⁵ Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion*, 111, 112, 113.

⁵²⁶ Liverani, “Impact,” 148.

⁵²⁷ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 47–48.

region of the empire as part of the larger pattern of organization of the Assyrian empire.⁵²⁸

Evidence for a late exilic author that cites mere awareness of punishment and exile without specific mention of Babylon need not thus refer to the Babylonian exile but could refer to the deportations of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. from Israel and Samaria, to the exiles into the far reaches of the empire, and to the refugees in Jerusalem. The passage in 2 Kings 22–23 dates to some such exilic period because the *vaticinium ex eventu* oracle of Huldah assumes the exile (2 Kgs 22:16–17): “I shall indeed bring disaster [*rāʿā*] on this place.” The *nābîʾāh* does not refer to Babylon but just to a disaster. The passage from Solomon’s prayer, “they are carried away captive to the land of the enemy far off or near” (1 Kgs 8:46–50), which Albertz says refers to the Babylonian exile, could refer to the eighth-century B.C.E. exiles to Assyria, since *hā-ʾōyēb rəḥôqāh ʾô qərôbāh* (the enemy far and near) does not translate into “Babylon” except by exegesis.⁵²⁹

The main points of the preceding archaeological and historical sections lead to the following proposals. Scholars, who pay attention to facts outside the DH, accept the reality of the destruction and exile of the states of Samaria and Israel by Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II (732–721 B.C.E.), the destruction and exile of the state of Judah by Sennacherib (701 B.C.E.), and the probable repopulation that followed it during the seventh century B.C.E. The present study refers to this period as Exile₁, since the devastation of the states of Israel and Judah during the eighth century B.C.E. and the isolation of the city of Jerusalem created conditions of exile for the authors of the DH. The Assyrian deportees from various nations across the empire threatened the existence and coherence of the city. At the same time, Jerusalem flourished in its status as a regional distribution center under the *pax Assyriaca*, and the loyal servants of ^dAššur and the scribes of ^dNabû would have prevailed. The goals of expansive nationalism and centralization of cult of the seventh century B.C.E. that emerged from Exile₁ reflect the imperialist values and central military command of the Assyrian overlords rather than native Canaanite values. Thus this study proposes that the authors of the DH, the *nābîʾīm*, adapted the values of the empire to their situation in Jerusalem and wrote their history to reflect a new, Assyrian-style imperialism.

7.1.3. Literature

As mentioned above, Keel’s comprehensive survey of the history of Jerusalem under the domination of Assyria depends on the literature of DtrG, which treated the salvation of Jerusalem from Sennacherib as a triumphal miracle

⁵²⁸ Stern, *Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods*, 3, 8–10, 19, 132; Mazar, “Assyrian Conquests,” 544–47.

⁵²⁹ Albertz, “Why a Reform,” 37–38.

that focused power and wealth into the city and proved the superiority of YHWH. Throughout the period of Assyrian domination, however, Manasseh, the “servant of Aššur,” submitted to the empire, built fortresses to protect Assyrian trade routes, broke relations with Arabia and Phoenicia, and followed the Assyrian policies of centralization and internationalization. A complex transformation, not recognized by DtrG, took place in Jerusalem through the binding and subjugation to Aššur, the presence of the Assyrian power structure, the deportation of the Jerusalem elite, the increased trade and international imperial wealth, and the Aramaization of the language.⁵³⁰ Although DtrG does not recognize the transformation, the deep structure of the narrative reveals the change that occurred in the image of YHWH—from desert patriarch to imperial commander—and the episteme/presuppositions of the authors—from local Phoenician-Canaanite dynastic to international Assyrian-Aramaic aggressor.

Keel adds to DtrG’s account that under the subjugation of Aššurbanipal, Josiah served the Assyrian coalition of landed gentry (*‘am hā-‘āreš*), royal servants, and temple priests. Josiah attacked the remaining Canaanite, Phoenician, and other cults of the nations of the deportees in a systematic and violent reorganization of Judah and Jerusalem in order to achieve central control and reorganization of the whole land. Josiah thus pursued the annexation of the north according to the command of YHWH as written in the scroll of the law (*sēper hab-bārīt / tôrat mōšeh*) discovered in the Jerusalem temple by the chief priest and the chief royal scribe. Keel hypothesizes thus that the cultural monopoly of Aššur over Jerusalem brought about the transference of the political vassal covenant to YHWH and marked the birth of Deuteronomistic theology at the same time as the discovery of the *sēper hab-bārīt*.⁵³¹ Yet Assyrian vassal treaties concluded with defeated or intimidated nations stipulated submission, loyalty, and obedience but did not command the annexation of land and the extermination of a subjugated vassal. Therefore the impetus for the annexation of the north did not come from the discovery and transference of a vassal treaty to YHWH but from some other source of ideology.

The reform, according to Keel and DtrG, consisted of a positive evaluation of Josiah as a follower of the *tôrat mōšeh*, the renovation of the temple, the discovery of the *tôrat mōšeh*, a consultation with the *nabî’āh* Hulda, the initiation of the people in the covenant, and the extermination of the other gods and their priests in the effort to centralize cult power in Jerusalem. The reform composition parallels the chiastic structure of the conquest composition of Joshua. The destruction of the alternate YHWH sanctuary in Bet-El, which Jeroboam had constructed, counted as a major accomplishment for

⁵³⁰ Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems*, 470–78.

⁵³¹ *Ibid.*, 470, 471, 478, 511.

Josiah as Jeroboam's secession had challenged the political authority of Jerusalem. The literary version of Josiah's reorganization thus relates his annexation of the north by means of the destruction of its cult centers and the elimination of its leaders. DtrG evaluated Josiah's total destruction of the cult places of the north as an act of obedience to YHWH and the *nəbî'im*.⁵³² Although Keel notes that the attack on the Canaanites came from the Assyrian party, that party could not have used vassal treaty ideology to justify the attack. The Assyrians of Jerusalem must have had a different, more aggressive policy and law to put into effect.

In order to evaluate the historicity of Josiah's reform, Keel appeals to the "general political situation" and, in particular, to the cessation of the political, religious, and economic domination of the NA empire. The collapse of the empire brought about a new consciousness of Jerusalem's local structures, values, and demands. The new society eliminated the emblems of the empire, and the cult purgation of Josiah fits into this symbol of change. According to Keel, however, the Assyrian vassal covenant did not disappear with the purge of superficial emblems by Josiah but carried over from the political into the theological realm and into the cultural episteme/presuppositions that changed the image of YHWH in Judah and Jerusalem.⁵³³ Keel's view—that the vassal treaty ideology accounts for Josiah's attack on the Canaanites and for deuteronomistic ideology—does not account for the aggressive imperial nature of the deuteronomistic covenant.

Sennacherib had destroyed the Judahite cities, displaced the population, built the series of forts, and established a cultural monopoly over Jerusalem. According to Keel, Josiah's goal of cult centralization followed upon this development and guided the political and economic development of Judah after 701 B.C.E. It aimed at the destruction of the local Canaanite-Phoenician shrines as the symbols of alternate former power centers (Deut 12:5–26). Keel thus asserts that the literary product of 2 Kings 22–23 follows the model of the NA vassal covenant. The oath, says Keel, constitutes the most important part of the treaty covenant.⁵³⁴ Yet an oath of loyalty that demands submission, loyalty, and obedience does not entail an aggressive military policy and the extermination of the vassal making the oath.

After seventy years of Assyrian domination, according to Keel, the Jerusalem elites sought alternatives to the bond to Aššur and to the king of the land of Aššur. Thus, they conceived of their relationship to YHWH in the pattern of the NA vassal covenant, and this expression constituted the birth of the theology of Deuteronomy and DtrG. It attests to a broad continuation of Assyrian structures of yoke of the king of the land of Aššur into the concept of the yoke of YHWH. Yet Keel limits the transference of power to YHWH as a

⁵³² Ibid., 511–32.

⁵³³ Ibid., 546–55.

⁵³⁴ Ibid., 555–77.

carryover of the role of the Assyrian king to that of YHWH. Accordingly, Keel cannot conceive of a formal covenant between the leaders and the people of YHWH outside of the background of the Assyrian vassal covenant treaty and loyalty oath formulas. The social laws came into Deuteronomy later.⁵³⁵

Because Keel focuses on the vassal covenant treaty as the model for the relationship between YHWH and the people, he conceives of YHWH's role in the covenant as that of the king to whom subjects owe allegiance. Yet the aggressive actions and commands of YHWH, Moses, Joshua, David, Hezekiah, Josiah, and all the other exemplary leaders of the YHWH-people go far beyond the ideology of the vassal treaty. The comparison of a king-role to a god-role, moreover, may constitute a fallacy of categories and does not account for the imperial actions of the kings and rulers bound to the god. The binding, held to constitute the indispensable element of the relationship in Keel's view, may account for a part of the covenant but does not explain the impetus to annexation and extermination of other nations.

The analogy of a vassal covenant between a lord and a defeated, subject nation, which requires submission and loyalty, does not account for YHWH's command for aggressive extermination of other gods, shrines, priests, and nations, who lived in the land before Israel because of their atrocities, such as the worship of the Ashera and the Canaanite-Phoenician god Ba'al. No other vassal treaty contains such a command to kill. One must look elsewhere for a comparable command.

The unstated justification for a command to exterminate multiple peoples in the name of the god, as Keel's survey accepts, lies in the clear fact that such atrocity-committing people could draw the people of YHWH to follow the other gods and thus cause YHWH to annihilate Israel. The Mesha stele of Moab attests to the killing (*herem*) of a defeated people and the consecration of their land to the Moabite god. Deuteronomy, according to Keel, postulates the killing of the resident population of the land for the conquest period as a radical delineation from all non-Israelites, and sees it as a reconquest of lands lost, not new land won, and thus as a postexilic composition.⁵³⁶ Yet this important element of Josiah's attack on the cults does not emerge from Assyrian vassal treaties. Vassal treaties stipulate severe punishments for vassals who secede from the empire; they do not command extermination for the simple fact of living on the god's land.

As the present study has asserted, the desire to reconquer lost lands could have occurred in the time of Josiah among the exiled population and *nābî'im* of Israel living in Jerusalem. After the destructions of Tiglath-pileser III, Šalmaneser III, Sargon II, and Sennacherib and the political, economic, and cultural subjugation of Esarhaddon and Aššurbanipal, the Assyrian party of

⁵³⁵ Ibid.

⁵³⁶ Ibid.

Jerusalem would have found themselves surrounded by various nations of deportees from across the empire. The attack and annexation of the whole country under the renewed image of YHWH as imperial god fits into the seventh-century-B.C.E. context of Josiah.

Keel attributes the hostility of Deuteronomy to Canaanite people and the nations and their cults to the northern *nābî'im*, who initiated the concept of the binding to one god in emulation of the exclusive duty vis-à-vis the king in the Neo-Assyrian loyalty oaths wherein apostasy to another god meant a crime worthy of the death-penalty. The Jerusalem royal servants and temple priesthood used the heritage of the northern *nābî'im* of Israel to establish the importance of a centralized Jerusalem to Judah in the exclusive covenant with YHWH. Keel proposes that Dtr's emphasis on the unnamed cult place (Jerusalem) and the relationship of YHWH with Jerusalem and the name theology can make sense within the context of the Neo-Assyrian influence on the theology of Jerusalem.⁵³⁷ Keel's continued use of the term "Israel" to describe the inhabitants of Jerusalem of the seventh century B.C.E. supports the assertion of the perspective and the powerful involvement of the northern Israelite *nābî'im*.

Keel's survey raises interesting but unresolved issues and problems. First, Josiah served the Assyrian party of Jerusalem, and that party included the chief priest and scribe of the city, who discovered the *sēper hab-bārît*. Second, Keel claims that DtrG recorded the creation of a new society based on the Assyrian vassal covenant treaty, but that relationship does not account for the imperial aggression of those servants bound to YHWH; nor does any vassal treaty contain a command to exterminate a submissive nation. Third, the vassal covenant presupposes a relationship with a king rather than a god, and thus Keel's analogy of the theology of Deuteronomy and DtrG with a vassal covenant may constitute either a fallacy of category or at least a mixed metaphor. Fourth, Keel accepts DtrG's justification for the extermination of the residents of the land because of their "atrocities," which neither Keel or DtrG ever elucidates. Keel adds the analogy with the ninth-century-B.C.E. Mesha stele, which relates a similar action against a population but does not contain a trace of vassal covenant ideology. Further, Keel adds the cultic need for separation from the nations, which may arise from postexilic concerns, but also does not appear in any vassal treaty. Fifth, Keel asserts that the *nābî'im* exiles from Israel initiated and brought with them to Judah the concept of a binding to one god, YHWH, and the concomitant hostility to the Canaanite-Phoenician gods Ba'al and 'Ašerāh. Thus Keel concludes that the Jerusalem elite and the *nābî'im* exiles from Israel together construed the covenant with YHWH along the lines of an Assyrian vassal covenant.

⁵³⁷ Ibid.

Keel's conclusion does not explain why or how the *nabî'im* exiles developed their concept of a binding to one god based on the Assyrian vassal covenant. It does not explain how the ideology of binding and a loyalty oath to a king applied to the binding of a people to one god. It leaves unanswered and unexplained the ideology of imperial aggression, extermination, and annexation, which drove the exemplary servant of YHWH.

The arguments about the influence of Assyrian literature on that of the DH revolve around the issues of whether it even exists, whether and how it might have influenced later religions (Parpola), the possibility of Akkadian literacy in the empire, the transmission of literary codes, treaty ideology in theology and cult, and Otto's presentation of deep and pervasive Assyrian influence.

The idea that a Josianic or exilic Dtr borrowed ideology from Assyrian treaties to create the YHWH religion may have a subversive intention, according to Lohfink: "the god of Israel is not the king of Assyria but Yhwh the unique Lord of his people!"⁵³⁸

By contrast Parpola tries to assert continuity between Assyrian religion and later religious aspects of the Hebrew Bible, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. He does not, however, address YHWH's key role as the guarantor of the political covenant.⁵³⁹ The present study does not discuss the issue of monotheism, but Parpola's case for Assyrian monotheism reflects one aspect of the Assyrian imperialist agenda that the later *nabî'im* asserted subsequent to the DH. Parpola finds in Assyrian literature evidence that hypostatized other gods represent separate powers that emanate from a single source defined as the god Aššur. This use of neoplatonic and medieval terminology (i.e., hypostatize, emanate) to interpret Assyrian religion reveals the theological presupposition of Parpola's analysis. In spite of presenting a convincing plethora of literary parallels between Assyrian literature and later religions, he does not include in his analysis the real and contemporaneous political and social realities of the Neo-Assyrian empire and the effects that it had on its subjects.

Parpola's mystical and anachronistic exegesis of the Assyrian tree contributes no historical understanding to Neo-Assyrian imperial policy and its effects on its subjects.⁵⁴⁰ Parpola applies the terms and values of a much later mystical system onto the tree and discovers a secret system hidden within the symbolism of the tree. The theory that the winged disk over the tree represents Aššur emanating power to the lesser gods on various branches derives from another anachronistic approach to the ancient world. Parpola's mystical exegesis on the name of Aššur has little historical value, because the name came from the earliest foundation of the city and has no connections to later mysticism. In addition, Parpola does not clarify his notion of monotheism

⁵³⁸ Lohfink, "Kerygmata," 94–96.

⁵³⁹ Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, xxi.

⁵⁴⁰ Idem, "Assyrian Tree of Life," 161–208.

but rather assumes that the position of the winged disk indicates that Aššur emanates and creates the other deities, whereas Assyrian literature, by contrast, asserts that Aššur rules over other *ilū*.

Parpola's discussion of monotheism in Assyria thus lacks the distinction between the dominating political role of Aššur in a military imperial system and the later ontological and philosophical role of the deity in the classical Greek system of thought.⁵⁴¹ Parpola writes that the statement from the Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon, "Aššur shall be your god," represents monotheism because it resembles a later formulation of the concept. Yet the supreme god of Assyria did not constitute a sole god, and calling the great gods hypostatized powers emanating from the art symbolism of a tree motif does not make them so. Parpola uses medieval theological and philosophical concepts to interpret Aššur's political dominance as an abstract metaphysical, transcendent entity, which emanates other hypostases.

Other scholars exclude Assyrian influence from the discussion about the development in DH religion. According to Hoffmann, no extrabiblical literary sources can confirm that the Assyrians imposed cultic pressure on their subjugated peoples or enforced the introduction of their state cult.⁵⁴² Free-will introduction of foreign cult elements of the victorious power did not take place either. Changes, including those attributed to Assyria, as Hoffmann argues, just occurred in Israel in the area of the cult reform, and Dtr focused on this tradition. Hoffmann understands the Josianic reform as a local movement of the prophetic circles (*nabî'im*) to abolish foreign Assyrian cult elements from the YHWH cult.

Any argument for the influence of Assyrian literature on the DH presupposes the Akkadian literacy of the Dtr scribes, authors, and editors. The presupposition of Akkadian literacy and of the presence of Akkadian documents in Jerusalem comes under criticism, according to Morrow, because the scribes of Jerusalem did not need to learn the Akkadian language, and they would not have had access to literary Neo-Assyrian documents.⁵⁴³ They would not have learned enough Akkadian to read Neo-Assyrian, as Morrow suggests, because the Assyrians did not copy or disseminate literary works to the periphery of the empire. Yet the distant site of Huzirina (Sultantepe) in South Turkey turned up a comprehensive Neo-Assyrian library of 400 tablets from the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. and suggests that the Assyrians did disseminate literature to the periphery of the empire.⁵⁴⁴ Na'aman affirms that an imperial Assyrian library of the seventh century B.C.E. would have

⁵⁴¹ Idem, "Monotheism in Ancient Assyria," 165–209.

⁵⁴² Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen*, 319.

⁵⁴³ Morrow, "Cuneiform Literacy," 207, 209, 210, and 211; review of Otto, *Das Deuteronomium*.

⁵⁴⁴ Sparks, *Ancient Texts*, 40; Gurney, "Sultantepe Tablets"; Gurney and Finkelstein, *Sultantepe Tablets*.

contained at least a selection of the same texts as found in Aššurbanipal's library.⁵⁴⁵

The presence of schools of scribes would require a developed elite class of professionals in a context of urbanization and centralized economic production, according to Jameison-Drake.⁵⁴⁶ He analyzes the data gathered from archaeological excavations and surveys to approach the question of writing in tenth century B.C.E. monarchic Israel and finds no trace of systems correlating to scribal activity or to an empire in the tenth century B.C.E. time period of the so-called empire of David.

Two recent archaeological discoveries, however, support the hypothesis of a scribal class (hence, a biblical United Kingdom) in Judah of the tenth century B.C.E. The Khirbet Qeiyafa ostrakon from a fortress in the valley of Elah has several possible readings.⁵⁴⁷ The excavation report presents the inscription as follows:⁵⁴⁸

[]'lt's[] . w'bd'
 .špt []b[] w'lm[] špty
 gr[]b'lt...m[]ky[]
 ' []m.nqmybdmlk
 rrm[] .šk.grt

Misgav, however, reads the inscription as follows:⁵⁴⁹

'l t's[] w'bd 't
 špt bw'lm []'lt
 '[]/ [] wb'lt
 []' [] wnqm yh/sd mlk g[t
 srn[...] mg/drt⁵⁵⁰

Misgav and Yardeni present translations with Phoenician names: *ysd mlk gt*, *bdmlk*, *'bd'*, *špt*, *grb'lt*, *qmy* (Ysd king of Gath, Bodmilk, 'Abda', Shaphat, Gerbaal, and Naqam). Galil, however, reconstructs the text, translates it as Hebrew prophecy, and ties it to early royal literary activity in the court of David and Solomon, as follows:

⁵⁴⁵ Na'aman, "Temple Library of Jerusalem," 129–52.

⁵⁴⁶ Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools*, 146–49.

⁵⁴⁷ Galil, Khirbet Qeiyafa Archaeological Project.

⁵⁴⁸ Khirbet Qeiyafa Archaeological Project.

⁵⁴⁹ Misgav, "Ostrakon," 243–57.

⁵⁵⁰ Galil, Khirbet Qeiyafa Archaeological Project.

'l t's w'bd 't]
 špt ['b[d] w'lm[n] špt yt[m]
 [w]gr [r]b 'll rb [d]l w
 'l]mn šqm ybd ml
 'b]yn [w]'bd šk gr t[mk]⁵⁵¹
 You shall not do [it], but worship the [Lord].
 Judge the sla[ve] and the wid[ow] / Judge the orph[an]
 [and] the stranger. [Pl]ead for the infant / plead for the po[or and]
 the widow. Rehabilitate [the poor] at the hands of the king.
 Protect the po[or and] the slave / [supp]ort the stranger.

The second discovery, an abecedary of the mid-tenth century B.C.E. from Tel Zayit in lower western Judah, represents a South Canaan branch of Phoenician script that, according to the authors, attests to the early appearance of alphabetic literacy in Judah.⁵⁵²

(1) ' b g d w h ḥ z ṭ y l k m n [s] [p] ['] [š] (2) [q] [r] š [t]

As the authors acknowledge, this script belongs to the main branch of Phoenician in the tenth century B.C.E. represented by the sarcophagus of Aḥiram, king of Byblos (*KAI* 1). It spread into Judah at the same time that the Phoenician mercantile activity expanded into the Mediterranean basin. Because of its archaeological context at the borderland of the highlands of Judah, however, the authors associate it with the kingdom of Judah, which by biblical reckoning began with David and Solomon in tenth-century B.C.E. Jerusalem. Neither of these two discoveries presents evidence beyond biblical tradition to support the thesis of an independent Hebrew scribal school in a developed patrimonial kingdom in Judah. Archaeology points to the tenth-century-B.C.E. development of Jerusalem as a Phoenician-Canaanite mercantile outpost with Phoenician architecture and writing.

Later on Jerusalem constituted a small state under Assyrian subjugation during the seventh century B.C.E., and Jamieson-Drake's systems approach of archaeology enabled him to predict the effects that large societies with strong political, economic, and cultural influence may have on smaller states.⁵⁵³ Thus he could predict that Jerusalem would have had the infrastructure to support a scribal class in the seventh century B.C.E. The population of Jerusalem grew during the seventh century B.C.E. after the destruction of Judah in 701 B.C.E., and Jerusalem developed into a complex state in the seventh century B.C.E. under the hegemony of Assyria. Although the systems

⁵⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵⁵² Tappy, "Abecedary of the Mid-Tenth Century B.C.E.," 5–46.

⁵⁵³ Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools*, 146–49.

approach suggests that no general knowledge of writing occurred in Judah prior to the eighth century B.C.E., writing did occur at forts built in a defensive and administrative network around Jerusalem in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. during the Neo-Assyrian period. The defensive network reflected a region within an interdependent economic network of a Neo-Assyrian pattern that depended on the communications skills of a scribal class in the service of the empire.

Some DH passages of the eighth or seventh century B.C.E. (Deut 24:3; Josh 18:9; Judg 8:13–17; 2 Sam 8:17), according to Jamieson-Drake, indicate the presence of scribal schools in Jerusalem.⁵⁵⁴ The archaeological model places scribal activity in the socioeconomic matrix of Jerusalem and its dependent sites in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E., but Jerusalem, at a size of fifty hectares, just 15 percent the size of an Assyrian city, would need the infrastructure of the imperial system in order to sustain a scribal school like that of the DH. This scribal class would correlate with the early deuteronomistic authors (in Cross's terms, Dtr₁, preexilic), who wrote during the Neo-Assyrian period at the time that Josiah had aimed at reconstructing the state of Judah. According to Na'aman, the seventh-century DH description of Joash's restoration of the temple of Jerusalem (836–798 B.C.E., 2 Kgs 12:5–17) reflects the literary characteristics of an imperial building inscription in the Assyrian style.⁵⁵⁵

In the period of the weakening Assyrian hegemony (640–612 B.C.E.), according to Liverani, Josiah took advantage of relaxed Assyrian controls to assert Judahite independence and to attempt to reunify Judah and Israel on a religious and ideological basis.⁵⁵⁶ The administrative plans for the district of the desert (*midbār*) (Josh 15:21–63) led Liverani to date the book of Joshua to the time of Josiah (640–609 B.C.E.) and to Josiah's recolonization plan. Josiah's situation in the seventh century B.C.E. would fit with the militaristic sense of the conquest narrative in the book of Joshua and, as Römer has argued, would explain the close literary correlation with the Neo-Assyrian conquest narratives.⁵⁵⁷ By following the DH account as history, however, Liverani leaves out the historical occupation of Judah and Israel by Assyrian deportees—the nations and their gods—whom the army of the Dtr god needed to conquer and to exterminate.

The literary accounts of the conquest in the book of Joshua, according to Römer and de Pury, may come from the Josianic period and derive from Assyrian conquest accounts.⁵⁵⁸ The debate focuses on the purpose of the accounts. Either the DH authors intended the accounts to support Josiah's expan-

⁵⁵⁴ Ibid., 150–53.

⁵⁵⁵ Na'aman, "Royal Inscriptions," 333–49.

⁵⁵⁶ Liverani, *Israel's History*, 171–75.

⁵⁵⁷ Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 69–71.

⁵⁵⁸ Römer and de Pury, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 113.

sionist policy (Jerusalem, seventh cent. B.C.E.), or they wanted to inspire the exiles to return and to reconquer the homeland (Yehud, fifth cent. B.C.E.). Yet Assyrian conquest accounts, like that of the DH, reflected an imperialistic ideology of terror that promoted Assyrian ethnocentric self-legitimation as a unique power over the rest of the enemy world that had no culture. The terms *nakru* (enemy) and *nakrūtu* (hostility) sum up the Assyrian attitude to non-Assyrians, according to Younger,⁵⁵⁹ just as the term *ʾāḥērīm* (other) applied to gods and peoples sums up the hostility of YHWH to the Canaanites and Emorites. Such Assyrian-style hostility fits better with the seventh century B.C.E. than with a Persian-style merciful grant to return and rebuild.

The depictions of submission in the Assyrian literary “transmission code” differ depending on the circumstances, as Younger observes.⁵⁶⁰ The enemy that submits stays alive but goes into exile, and the enemy that resists suffers submission by destruction and exile of survivors. In the end, the Assyrian king makes the enemy submit one way or the other. The DH narrative structure of the conquest communicates the same historical ideology and has the same transmission code as the Assyrian conquest accounts. The syntagma (syntactic element) of the submission of the enemy to the *pulḥi melammī* (terror of the radiance) of YHWH, the king, and the army appears in Joshua 9 after Joshua had destroyed Ai: *ʾāšer heḥērīm ʾēt kol-yōšābē hā-ʾāy* (that he exterminated all the inhabitants of (the) ‘Ai; Josh 8:26). Adoni-Zedeq and Jabin fight with Joshua, but the Gibeonites submit to Joshua and the terror of YHWH and thus receive a treaty: *lā-šēm yhwh ʾēloheykā ki-šāmaʾnū ... ʾabdēykem ʾānaḥnū* (because of the name of *yhwh* your god, for we have heard a report of him ... we are your servants; Josh 9:9–11). The syntagmas of *pulḥi melammī* (terror of the radiance) and submission form part of the transmission code of conquest accounts shared by Assyrian imperial inscriptions and the DH. The conquest account of Joshua 9–12, according to Younger, thus reflects the transmission code of Assyrian conquest accounts.⁵⁶¹ About his second *girru* (campaign), Sennacherib wrote as follows:

Like a wild bull I crashed through. The cities of ... I besieged and I captured. People, horses, mules, asses, cattle, and sheep from their midst I brought out; I counted as spoil. And their small cities, which are without number, I destroyed, devastated, and turned into ruins. The houses of the steppe, the tents, in which they dwell, I burned with fire and turned them into ashes.”⁵⁶²

⁵⁵⁹ Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 55–78.

⁵⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 112–24.

⁵⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 233–48.

⁵⁶² Sennacherib’s Second Campaign, I:65–80, in Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 112.

Joshua, in like manner, “took the whole region ... totally destroyed all who breathed just as YHWH the *ʾēlohîm* of Israel had commanded” (Josh 10:40–42). The Joshua conquest narrative uses figurative hyperbole in the tradition of Assyrian *kašādu* (conquest), but the ensuing book of Judges and the DH confirm that the struggle with the local population went on until the exile.

The DH, according to Younger, also uses iterative elements of the Assyrian transmission code in Joshua 10 and 11. Sargon’s letter to god describes the god’s intervention in a battle to produce a great slaughter of the enemy, just as the story of the capture and execution of the five kings has precedent in Sargon’s defeat of the Urartu king: “These five kings fled and hid themselves in the cave ... Joshua struck them down and put them to death” (Josh 10:16–27). Similar syntagmas and precedents for Joshua’s conquest account appear in the stories of Aššurbanipal’s defeat of the Elamite king, Esarhaddon’s treatment of fugitives, and Sennacherib’s treatment of princes: “mighty princes feared my battle array, fled their abodes, and like bats flew alone to inaccessible places.”⁵⁶³

Histories contain cultural and religious encoding, according to Cohen, and the expression, “the splendor [*pulḥī melammī*] of Aššur overwhelmed them,” refers both to the army of Aššur and to the fear inspired by that army.⁵⁶⁴ This cultural encoding also emerges in the narrative theology of the DH, which reports events as instances of YHWH’s intervention. Thus the apologies of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, according to Cohen, resemble the royal apology of David. Historians arrange their materials according to their cultural and religious encoding just as a literary artist does, and a narrative history, such as the DH, presents an ensemble of various kinds of writing as a single coherent code.

Further evidence of possible Neo-Assyrian literary influence on the Deuteronomist, according to Richter, comes from the so-called “name theology” of Deuteronomy and its characteristic phrase: *lě-šakkēn šēmô šām* (to establish his name there).⁵⁶⁵ The characteristic Dtr phrase *lě-šakkēn šēmô šām* derives from the Akkadian dedication formula *šumam šakānum* (he established a name). Jerusalem scholars and scribes would have learned the phrase and the concept through direct contact with Assyrians and their imperial inscriptions and annals.

The literary passage about the *rab-šāqê* at the walls of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 18:26–28), according to Cohen, illustrates the way in which the Deuteronomists employed Assyrian literary tropes to tell their own version of history.⁵⁶⁶ Since both the DH and Assyrian doctrine taught that subjects and rulers alike in the four quarters had to obey the commands of a universal god, the *rab-*

⁵⁶³ Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 204–21.

⁵⁶⁴ Cohen, “Neo-Assyrian Elements,” 36–44.

⁵⁶⁵ Richter, *Deuteronomistic History*.

⁵⁶⁶ Cohen, “Neo-Assyrian Elements,” 32–48.

šāqê claimed that submitting to the god Aššur amounted to obeying the command of YHWH, who commanded even the god Aššur from Dtr's point of view. According to Dubovsky, this pericope illustrates just one of the many tactics of psychological warfare deployed by the Assyrians in overcoming their enemies.⁵⁶⁷ It also points to Dtr's adaptation of Assyrian psychological tactics by means of encoding the local god YHWH with similar, but even greater, omnipotence.

Significant convergences occur between Deut 28:20–44 and the Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon (VTE), according to Steymans, and provide clear evidence that Assyrian treaty forms influenced the ideology of Deuteronomy.⁵⁶⁸ He points out a common theme of downfall caused by breach of treaty in VTE and the defeat of Israel and Judah before their enemies in the Hebrew text. In both texts, the defeated people suffer multiple common or similar punishments, which include having foreigners take their land and animals eating their flesh.

Given the physical differences between the empire of Assyria and the city of Jerusalem, according to Steymans, a common ancient Near Eastern curse tradition cannot account for the literary similarity between the curses of the VTE and those of Deut 28:20–44. Levantine curse traditions do not reflect Assyrian imperial threats, but a close literary comparison of VTE § 56 with Deut 28:20–44 suggests many common characteristics. The parallel sequences of food and drink, ointment and home correspond between the VTE and Deut 28:38–44. To the placement of the clothing curse in line 492, Dtr compares the deportation curse that emphasizes the destruction or denuding of the land through the enemy and the pests. The curse expresses a fear that resident foreigners will rise up, change into oppressors and make the people second class and the homeland a foreign place. Dtr interprets and changes the Assyrian guideline to fit the new situation.⁵⁶⁹

Toward the end of Assyrian rule over Jerusalem, Judah, and Israel, the ruling elite of Jerusalem asserted its independence from Assyria and rejected the superficial aspects of its culture. The imperial threats of violence, disaster, disease, exile, and death in Deut 28:20–44, which Dtr borrowed from the VTE, suggest that Dtr retained and adapted more than just a few literary tropes but the core political ideology with which Josiah annexed and redefined the territories of Judah and Israel.

Literary and linguistic evidence in the curses section of Deut 28:20–44 indicates a close relationship between it and the threats (so-called “curses”) section in the vassal treaty of Esarhaddon (VTE). The literary analysis carried out by Paul-Eugène Dion suggests that the author of Deuteronomy followed the curse section of the VTE in outline and expanded and adapted it to the

⁵⁶⁷ Dubovsky, *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies*.

⁵⁶⁸ Steymans, *Deuteronomium* 28, 92.

⁵⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 435.

situation in Jerusalem by means of enumeration, metaphor, futility curses, and change of god-name.⁵⁷⁰

The outline proposed by Steymans shows that Deut 28:20–44 follows the schema of the VTE as a whole and the chiasmic structure of § 56 of the VTE, as the tables below illustrate.⁵⁷¹

VTE	Deut 28:20–44	VTE § 56 (472–494)
1.	(20) Introduction	Introduction
2.	(21) Plague	(A) Death/Death-spirit
3.	(22) Illnesses	(B) Ash/Shadow
4. § 63 Earth/sky	(23) Sky/earth	(C) Hunger/Thirst
5. § 64 Rain	(24) Rain	(D) Epidemic
6. § 65 Enemy	(25) Enemy	
7. § 41 Eagle/vulture	(26) Bird/animal	(E) Dog/Pig
8. § 39 <i>saḥaršubbû</i> Ulcers	(27) (A) <i>grb</i> Scurvy	(a) Corpse Desecrator
9. § 40 Confusion	(28) (B) Confusion	(b) No Burial
10. Darkness	(29) Darkness	(F) Darkness
11. Injustice	(C) Robbery	
12. § 42 Enemy	(30) Enemy	(E') Flood
13.	(31f) Animals/children	
14.	(33) (C') Robbery	(b') Suffering before Death
15. § 38A Headache	(34) (B') Instability	(a') Defeat
16. Illness	(35) (A') <i>šhyn</i> Sores	(D') Illness
17.	(38f) Seed/vineyard	(C') Food/Drink
18.	(40f) Oil/children	(B') Ointment/Clothing
19.	(43f) Foreigners	(A') Demons.

The introduction illustrates part of the creative literary process by which the Deuteronomist adapted the VTE to Jerusalem by shortening the god list to one and then expanding the list of punishments for disloyalty.⁵⁷² The god list preceding the introduction includes Aššur, Ninlil, Sin, Šamaš, Ninurta, Ištar, Nēberu (Jupiter), Marduk, Šarpanitu, Belit, Adad, Nergal, Gula, Seven Gods, and an unnamed god.

Deut 28:20–44.	VTE § 56 (472–493)
1. Introduction	Introduction
20. YHWH	(472) The great gods of the sky and the earth, dwelling in (<i>wašābu</i>) the world (473) as many as (<i>mala</i>) are in this tablet, let their names be mentioned.

⁵⁷⁰ Dion, “Deuteronomium 28,” 271–75.

⁵⁷¹ Steymans, *Deuteronomium* 28, 119, 311.

⁵⁷² *Ibid.*, 301.

will send among you the curse (<i>m^ēērā</i>),	(474) May they beat you (<i>maḥāṣu</i>).
the discomfiture (<i>m^ēhûmâ</i>),	May they frown upon you (<i>nekelmû</i>).
and the rebuke (<i>mig^ēeret</i>)	(475) May they curse you (<i>liruru-kunu</i>)
in every effort of your hand,	furiously with an evil curse (<i>arratu</i>).
which you may do,	
until you are destroyed and perish quickly	
because of the offence (<i>ro^ʿa</i>) of your deeds.	(476) On high, may they tear
Because you abandoned me,	the lives (<i>balāṭi</i>) out of you (<i>nasāḥu</i>).

The following table, section 12 of Steymans's outline of parallels, illustrates the literary processes of enumeration, metaphor, and futility curses that Dtr used to adapt the threats to Israel:

12. § 42 Enemy	(E') Flood
Deut 28:20–44	VTE
30. You will become engaged	[§ 42 <i>Ištar</i> curse: Wife lies with enemy.]
to (<i>r^ēarēš</i>) a woman,	
but another man will lie with her.	
You will build a house but not live in it.	
You will plant a vineyard (<i>kerem</i>)	(487) In moaning and anxiety,
but not harvest (<i>r^ēhall^ēlennâ</i>) it.	may your life come to an end (<i>qatû</i>).
31. Your bull (<i>šôr^ēkā</i>) may be	
butchered (<i>tābûa</i> ') before your eyes,	
but you will not eat of it.	
Your ass (<i>ḥāmor^ēkā</i>)	(488) A flood (<i>bibbulu</i>)
will be stolen from before you	that can not be withstood
and not return to you.	from (the heart of) the earth
Your sheep (<i>šoⁿēkā</i>)	(489) may it come up (<i>lilāma?</i>).
will be given to your enemy,	May a devastating flood
for there is no helper for you.	be imposed on you.

Where Esarhaddon describes a devastating flood, typical of Mesopotamia, Dtr enumerates the threats with the metaphor of an unleashed enemy, who will steal the disloyal subject's wife and possessions and make futile the efforts of the disloyal servant.

This comparison may also reveal that Dtr employed a familiar process similar to biblical parallelism in which the repetition of a theme with a similar metaphor retains Esarhaddon's sense while changing its mode of expression. Dtr tries to capture the sense in which a subject of YHWH, who would not experience a flood in the hills of Judah or Israel, might experience through

robbery the moaning and anxiety caused by the devastation of a flood. Dtr adds further the horror of the enslavement of one's children.⁵⁷³

The linguistic evidence and the close association of Dtr's vocabulary with Aramaic and the lack of clear association with the Akkadian may indicate that Dtr followed an Aramaic translation as Dion proposed.⁵⁷⁴ It may also indicate nothing more than the close association of Hebrew with Aramaic in the family of West Semitic languages as opposed to Akkadian in the smaller family of East Semitic languages. The following table compares a small sample of the vocabulary of Deut 28:20–44 with the corresponding roots of Aramaic, Akkadian, and Ugaritic.

1. Intro.	Hebrew	Aramaic	Akkadian	Ugaritic
curse	<i>m^ēērā</i> , יר	<i>m^ēērā</i>	<i>arāru</i> to curse	lacking
discomfiture	<i>m^ēhūmā</i> , <i>hwm</i>	<i>m^ēhūmā</i>	י ^w , <i>ewūm</i> impose on	lacking
rebuke	<i>mig^ēeret</i> , ג ^r	<i>mag^ēūrī</i>	ג ^r , <i>giāru</i> challenge	lacking
offence	<i>ro^a</i> , ר ^{cc}	<i>rā^a</i> do evil	<i>raggu</i> wicked ⁵⁷⁵	lacking
2. Plague	Hebrew	Aramaic	Akkadian	Ugaritic
plague	<i>dāber</i> , דבר	<i>deber</i> pestilence	<i>dibiru</i> calamity	<i>dbr</i> Rücken
3. Illnesses	Hebrew	Aramaic	Akkadian	Ugaritic
consumption	<i>šaḥpet</i> , שֶׁחַפֵּת	<i>šāḥap</i> lose flesh	שֶׁפ, <i>šepu</i> foot	lacking
fever	<i>qadaḥat</i> , קְדַחַת	<i>qādaḥ</i>	<i>qādu</i> ignite	lacking
inflammation	<i>dalleqet</i> , דַּלְקַת	<i>dālaq</i> burn	?	lacking
feverish heat	<i>ḥar^ēhur</i> , חֶרֶחֶר	<i>ḥar^ēhūrā</i>	י ^{rr} , <i>arāru</i> to glow	י ^{rr} brennen
sword	<i>ḥereb</i> , חֶרֶב	<i>ḥereb</i>	י ^{rb} , <i>erēbu</i> enter	lacking
scorching	<i>šiddāpôn</i> , שִׁדְדָּפוֹן	<i>šdp</i> to burn	?	lacking
mildew	<i>yērāqôn</i> , יֵרָאֻן	<i>yērāqôn</i>	<i>wraq</i> , <i>arāqu</i> yellow	lacking ⁵⁷⁶

The relative lack of corresponding Akkadian roots and the overwhelming lack of corresponding Ugaritic terms or roots suggests the hypothesis that Dtr did not make use of a native West Semitic, Canaanite-Phoenician vocabulary but borrowed the vocabulary of curses and punishment from imperial Aramaic language, which reflected the contemporaneous Assyrian imperial worldview.

By contrast, Dtr chooses terms consistent with Ugaritic and West Semitic roots to denote a common Levantine livestock culture as the following table illustrates.

⁵⁷³ Ibid., 306.

⁵⁷⁴ Dion, 271–75.

⁵⁷⁵ Black et al., *Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*, xvii–xxiv.

⁵⁷⁶ Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik*, 950–58.

Vocab.	Hebrew	Aramaic	Akkadian	Ugaritic ⁵⁷⁷
bull	šô ^r , šwr	šôr	šûru	tôru
butchered	ṭābūaḥ, ṭbḥ	ṭabâḥ	ṭabâḥu	ṭabaḥu
ass	ḥāmôr, ḥmr	ḥāmôr	imêru	ḥimāru
sheep	šo'n, š'n	šo'n	šênu	ša'nu.

These common words do not suggest a provenance in Akkadian political dominance. Where Aramaic and Ugaritic terms differ, however, Dtr chooses the Aramaic. This suggests both a direct literary transmission from Aramaic as well as a longer-term, local linguistic development.

From an assemblage of the threats according to form and content, Streck has proposed a typology and a hypothesis that the vocabulary of the threats indicates the effects of an invading army: “land, water, clothing, household, deity and ruler, enemy, law, illness, death, after-death, and unspecified evil.”⁵⁷⁸

Frankena presents evidence that Deut 28:20–44 represents “an elaboration of an Assyrian *Vorlage*.”⁵⁷⁹ Dtr takes up all the main points of Esarhaddon’s treaty— injustice, blindness, darkness, dispossession, robbery, etc.— and expands on them.⁵⁸⁰

According to Steymans, Dtr arranged the themes common to VTE and Deut 28:20–44 in such a close sequence that literary criticism cannot allow for separate provenances. Deut 28:20–44 reveals a unique writer in the DH tradition, perhaps a new redactor (DtrVTE), who translated and reworked Esarhaddon’s foreign language text. As attested in the close study of the text, the method involved a form of extension and amplification, which Steymans calls an *Übersetzerzusatz* (translator-addition), of the Assyrian model text.⁵⁸¹

The present study proposes that this passage would reflect the concerns of the remnant population of Jerusalem during the seventh century B.C.E. while surrounded by foreigners from the eastern edge of the empire. Although the DH says nothing about the repopulation of Judah, the Sargonid kings, according to Tadmor, had settled the new cities in the west with deportees from “the people of the mountains and the sea” of Sumer, Edom, and Urartu as standard practice.⁵⁸² The correlation of Deut 28:20–44 with VTE as a whole and with VTE § 56 reflects the literary method that Dtr used to adapt the

⁵⁷⁷ Tropper, *Ugaritisch: Kurzgefasste Grammatik*.

⁵⁷⁸ Streck, “Die Flüche im Sukzessionsvertrag Asarhaddons,” 169–91.

⁵⁷⁹ Frankena, “Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon,” 145.

⁵⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 149.

⁵⁸¹ Steymans, *Deuteronomium* 28, 311.

⁵⁸² Tadmor, “Assyria and the West,” 37–38; Oded, *Mass Deportations*, 26–31, 77–78; Younger, “Repopulation of Samaria,” 254–75; Stern, *Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods*, 3; Liverani, “Impact,” 149–51; Na’aman, *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors*, 203–9.

Assyrian imperial threats to the aspirations of Jerusalem's seventh-century-B.C.E. ruling elite.

The reform program of Josiah and Dtr, according to Otto, reveals a comprehensive and thorough literary and religious correspondence between Assyrian syntagmas and those of Dtr. The reform entailed the demand for the confession of the uniqueness of YHWH of Israel and the demand for undivided loyalty (Deut 6:4, 5). The complementary demand for cult centralization suggests, according to Otto, the "rationality and modernity" of the development. Yet Otto does not account for Sennacherib's deportation of the population (701 B.C.E.) and the resettlement of Assyrian deportees from the extremities of the empire. Such repopulation of the area would have destroyed the existing population and caused a loss of local Canaanite family religion and kinship. Yet he asserts that the Deuteronomic reform answered this Assyrian crisis with the oath of allegiance and the centralization policies (Deuteronomy 14, 15, 26). The new social relationship, established as a theocracy, assumed the central holiness of the rule of one god. Assyrian imperialist religion thus replaced Levantine family religion, which disappeared with the deportations, although Otto refers to the change as a rational and modern development. The Josianic reforms (2 Kgs 23:11), according to Otto, represent the subversion of Assyria, and the program of cult centralization had an anti-Assyrian point. Josiah and the Dtr scribes wanted to make the local god equal to Aššur and as "rational" as Aššur in one holy place in his own city of Jerusalem. Without a hint of the irony in this statement, Otto asserts that the specific quality of DH religion consists not of covenant but rather of the revolt against Assyrian rule and imperial ideology by means of covenant theology.⁵⁸³

The Deuteronomic reform program, according to Otto, "reformulates and actualizes the traditional law and makes use of Neo-Assyrian motifs at the same time." The oath of allegiance made to the local god subverted Esarhaddon's program and centralized the cult in Jerusalem in order to oppose the cult centralization of Assyria. The whole reform constituted an alternative to the Neo-Assyrian world and its political claims by opposing loyalty to the local god to that of Aššur. Otto asserts in this way that YHWH took on the significant characteristics of the god Aššur for the purpose of resistance and revolt against Aššur.⁵⁸⁴

The Deuteronomic reform of Josiah, according to Otto, thus emerged from the Neo-Assyrian worldview and incorporates Neo-Assyrian social policy derived from Assyrian royal ideology. Dtr used Assyrian state texts, like the VTE, to reformulate the continuity of the tradition because such "modernization" served their defiance. The Dtr reform begins with the new idea entailed in the phrase *šəma' yisrael* (Deut 6:4), in which YHWH demands awareness

⁵⁸³ Otto, *Das Deuteronomium*, 74, 86, 365.

⁵⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 364.

of his uniqueness and the demand for individual, personal loyalty. The whole Deuteronomic reform program then follows from the modern oath of allegiance to YHWH, and the severity of the curses of Deut 28:22–40 affirm that the oath involved a life and death decision for the writers of the period.⁵⁸⁵

In the view of the present study, however, this deuteronomistic oath of allegiance does not represent the first time in covenant history that subjects swore allegiance to a god because the Assyrians also brought to the Deuteronomists the policy of swearing allegiance to the god. The Assyrians swore allegiance to the god Aššur and to the servant of Aššur (the king) in the presence of Aššur. Thus the *adê* oath meant obedience to the god Aššur just as well as to his representative and servant the king and to the whole Assyrian military administration. According to Postgate, Aššur functioned as a “symbolic personification of the city and the state of Aššur,” (^{URU}Aššur and ^{KUR}Aš^{ki}), and the governors of the provinces then owed personal loyalty to the king and the god.⁵⁸⁶

Assyrian imperial religion, according to Otto, had significant influence on the developments of DH religion during the Sargonid hegemony over Jerusalem in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. In Sennacherib’s Throne Ascent hymn, the god Aššur (here ^dAN.ŠAR₂ *’ilu/šāmu kiššatu* “god/heaven of all”) of the land and city of Aššur, *abi šamê* (father of the skies) controlled the destiny of the gods and granted universal rule to the Assyrian king of kings (*šar šarāni*). The (*w*)*ardu* (servant) king made his *adê* (oath) to Aššur and acted as the one god’s representative. The other gods (*w*)*arādu* (served) Aššur. Treason against the king or the state of Assyria counted as a state crime against the god.⁵⁸⁷ In the same way, YHWH of the DH received the oath of allegiance as a god of creation with universal claim to lands and jurisdiction over the peoples of the world.

The Assyrians had adapted the Aramaic term, *dy* (witness), as the imperial oath in the Aramaic west, and the loanword *adê* first appears in Assyrian documents in the treaty of Aššur-nirari V (754–745 B.C.E.) with the Aramaean Mati’ilu of Arpad.⁵⁸⁸ Aššurbanipal, for instance, used the following terms: treaties of the great gods (*a-di-e* MU DINGIR.MEŠ), treaties (*rik-sa-a-te*), my treaties (*a-di-ia*), oath to the great gods (*ma-mit* DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ), oath of Aššur (*ma-mit* ^d*aš-šur*), and treaties (*a-di-e*).⁵⁸⁹ The Deuteronomists, according to Otto, transferred the concept of the *adê* sworn to Aššur to the *bərît* (oath of allegiance) sworn to YHWH. The local DH god, YHWH, took over this Assyrian religious legitimization process with his own

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid., 374.

⁵⁸⁶ Postgate, “Land of Assur,” 252.

⁵⁸⁷ Otto, *Das Deuteronomium*, 69–70.

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid., 20.

⁵⁸⁹ Oded, *War*, 11.

oath of allegiance, and this oath marks the birth of the theology of loyalty and obedience in Deuteronomy. Otto affirms that Deut 13:2–20 demands the same *adê* “absolute loyalty to Yahweh” and threatens violence for disloyalty. The “*Urdeuteronomium*” (Deuteronomy 5–11) represents the *adê* oath of allegiance to the YHWH. The deuteronomistic program thus originated with Assyrian midwifery but turned against it, and according to Otto, stands as a rational, modern, and fundamentalist religious revolt.⁵⁹⁰ Otto finds that Dtr both absorbed Assyrian imperial ideology and then transcended it with even more rationality and theological sophistication to rebel against the Assyrians. Otto’s analysis illustrates the many ways in which Dtr derived the revolutionary covenant for YHWH from Assyrian imperial ideology, but Otto stops short of drawing a revolutionary conclusion.

The present study steps beyond Otto’s analysis and does not perceive a fundamentalist religious revolt, as Otto claims, or a return to pristine or tribal Mosaic values as Dtr claims. A comparison of the ideology expressed in the Assyrian imperial inscriptions with the deuteronomistic covenant reveals a close thematic correspondence in their basic policies and organization. Dtr transformed the local Phoenician and Canaanite god, YHWH, into an adaptation of the god Aššur, and the so-called conquest and reform represented a war to exterminate the remnant and recalcitrant Phoenician and Canaanite population as well as the various nations of deportees, who did not accept the new YHWH. This study attempts to explain what scholars have perceived as a revolutionary, rational, cosmic, theological shift in Jerusalem in the seventh century B.C.E. instead as a historical shift in power from the earlier Phoenician and Canaanite ruling class to a new class of rulers, either Assyrian or otherwise, who had adapted the military imperial covenant of Assyria to the reborn ideal kingdom of Israel as described in the DH.

7.2. *Neo-Assyrian Inscriptions and the Deuteronomistic Covenant*

The above evidence of scholarship points to the significant impressions that Assyria had on the authors of the DH. Otto observes a deep connection between the Assyrians and the DH but then backs off and calls the DH a fundamentalist religious revolt. The present study, however, interprets the revolt as a shift in political power from the Phoenician and Canaanite sphere to the Assyrian sphere under the cloak of a local historical development. Dtr’s YHWH, however, did not grow up in the Levant, nor did this god originate in Hattuša. The YHWH of the DH gathered his army, marched into a new land, conquered it, transformed it in his own image, and claimed it for his followers. Because his followers did not complete the command to exterminate the people and the other gods, the supreme military commander YHWH punished

⁵⁹⁰ Otto, *Das Deuteronomium*, 73.

them for their crime of disobedience. This study now brings together key passages from the imperial inscriptions (ch. 5) and arranges them according to the elements of the DH (ch. 2) in order to illustrate the correlation and consistency of the direct commands from YHWH, the presuppositions concerning YHWH and the law, and the severity of the punishments for disobedience to the commands of the god and the *nabî'im*.

7.2.1. Declaration of War: Conquest

The god Aššur sends his armies to war and commands the Neo-Assyrian emperors to conquer many lands, as the following selection of texts indicates:

Aššurnāširpal II:

When Aššur, the great lord, called me by name ... had placed his merciless weapon in my lordly arms, and in his anger had commanded me to conquer and to subdue and to rule the lands, with the help of the weapon of Aššur, my lord.⁵⁹¹

i (31) In those days, the authority of my [offices of] king and lord came forth by the command of the great gods. I am king. I am lord. ... (40) When Aššur ... (42) commanded me to subdue and to administer the lands, the mountains, and the highlands, ... (45) I mustered my chariots and troops. ... (46) I marched to the land of Tumme and conquered the city. ... (48) I massacred many, I carried off captives and livestock. ... (53) Their cities (54) I turned over, demolished, and burned by fire.⁵⁹²

Šalmaneser III:

(15) I mustered chariots and troops ... I captured the city ... (17) I burned (it) ... Tribute ... (19) I received ... (27) The fear of the radiance of Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed them. ... They submitted ... I imposed my yoke on them. (31) I besieged the city, captured it, massacred many, carried off plunder ... 35) I made an image of myself ... (36) I wrote praises of Aššur ... (40) I took the path to the sea of the land of Amurru ... (56) They trusted in each other and prepared for battle. (57) Against me they attacked. With the great power of the divine standard, I proceeded forward. With the fierce weapons that Aššur presented, I fought and set defeat on them ... (65) I crossed the Orontes River ... (69) By the command of Aššur, my lord, (70) I scat-

⁵⁹¹ Oded, *War*, 11; Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers I* (RIMA 2), 196. The Akkadian text appears in chapter 5 of the present study.

⁵⁹² Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers I* (RIMA 2), 195–223.

tered their forces ... I besieged the city, captured it, and carried off heavy plunder.⁵⁹³

(1) Aššur, great god, king of all the great gods ... (5) Šalmaneser [III] king of all the peoples ... (12) killed all his enemies and annihilated them like a flood.

ii (89) I approached his royal city of Qarqar. (90) I razed, destroyed, and burned it. ... (91) 2000 chariots and 10,000 troops of Aḥabbu (92) of the land of Sir'alayya ... (97) From the city of Qarqar, I defeated them.⁵⁹⁴

Tiglath-pileser III:

(1) The cities of Simirra and Arqa (2) I annexed (*u₂-tir-ra*) to the land of Aššur. I placed over them two courtiers as governors. (3) The whole broad land of Bit-Hazael, from Mount Lebanon as far as the cities of Gilead, Abel, ... (4) on the border of Bit-Ḥumria, I annexed to the land of Aššur. I placed my courtier as governor over them. (5) Hiram of Tyre, who plotted with Rezin ... I captured Mahalab, his fortified city along with other large cities. (9) The entire land of Bit-Ḥumria I captured. ... With their belongings, I carried them off to the land of Aššur. (10) I placed Ausi'i in the office of king over them.⁵⁹⁵

Aššurbanipal:

I mobilized my combat forces ... Upon the command of Aššur and Marduk, ... who encouraged me by ... a message of ecstasies ... I cut off the head of Teumman.⁵⁹⁶

Although Dtr incorporated YHWH's command into the so-called law code and the social, juridical, and social instructions, the plot of the DH reveals that the declaration of war and the primary command of the supreme state authority to annihilate the people and their gods remains in effect until the end. YHWH, too, commanded his servant Moses and the army to attack and to annihilate the entire population of Canaan, as the following passages illustrate:

Go to the mountain of the Emorites and its surrounding area ... as far as the great river Euphrates ... See, I have given to you the land. Go and take possession of the land that YHWH swore to your fathers (Deut 1:7–8).

When YHWH your *ēlōhîm* brings you to the land to which you are coming to possess, and he drives away many peoples from your

⁵⁹³ Idem, *Assyrian Rulers II* (RIMA 3) 8–10. Šalmaneser III, A.O.102.1.

⁵⁹⁴ Ibid., 11–24. Šalmaneser III, A.O.102.2.

⁵⁹⁵ Tadmor and Yamada, *Royal Inscriptions*, 131–32.

⁵⁹⁶ Nissinen, *References to Prophecy*, 45.

presence ... When you attack them, you shall annihilate them entirely. Do not make a treaty with them and do not show mercy to them (Deut 7:1–2).

For you shall completely exterminate the Hittites, the Emorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivvites, and the Jebusites according as YHWH your *ʾēlōhîm* commanded you (Deut 20:17).

The formulaic condemnations of the kings in the last chapters of 2 Kings that express a cult and “law” terminology dealing with the veneration of other gods, “he abandoned YHWH and served the other gods,” mask the more serious offense of disobedience to YHWH’s command to destroy them in the first place.⁵⁹⁷ The ongoing presence of the *ʾēlōhîm ʾāḥērîm* attests to the disobedience and criminal conduct of the kings within the context of imperial law. The DH thus introduces and continues, as its state constitution and law enforced by the state, the long-standing and consistent tradition of the imperial Assyrian projection of power that most resembles Tiglath-pileser III’s law of annexation. The law of annexation commanded the same destruction of local populations by death or exile and the reshaping of the landscape to serve the needs of Aššur.

7.2.2. Obedience

The Assyrian inscriptions and the DH share a consistent demand for obedience to the imperial god, whose organization depends on oath-taking and loyalty. Šalmaneser III employs the language of loyalty, trust, and the army/weapon to enforce obedience from all the lands, as follows:

(11) When Aššur, the great lord, in the loyalty of his heart and with his pure eyes, chose me, and for the office of shepherd of the land of Aššur named me, (12) he appointed to me the strong weapon, which kills the disobedient, and he crowned me with a great crown. (13) He furiously commanded me to subdue all the lands not submissive to Aššur and to exercise dominion.⁵⁹⁸

Tiglath-pileser III uses the language of the yoke, which implies the obedience of an ox under the command of its master, to justify his conquest and annexation of a city, as follows:

(1) On top of a mound of rubble (2) called Ḫumut, I made a city. ... (3) I named it Kār-Aššur. I set up in its midst the weapon of Aššur,

⁵⁹⁷ Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen*, 327

⁵⁹⁸ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers II* (RIMA 3) 7–8. Šalmaneser III, A.O.102.1.

my lord. I settled in its midst people from lands conquered by my hand. (4) I imposed upon them tribute and tax and counted them with the inhabitants of the land of Aššur. ... (8) I ruled. I took them captive to the land of Aššur. I placed my commander over them as governor. ... (11–12) I imposed upon them the yoke of Aššur, my lord, as upon the people of Aššur.⁵⁹⁹

By contrast, Esarhaddon rewarded Baal of Tyre for his obedience, as in the following passage:

I (1) *Adê*-treaty ... (2) Baal, king of Tyre, ... III (2) with Esarhaddon, king of the land of Aššur. ... (18) These are the ports and the trade routes which Esarhaddon, king of the land of Aššur, [commissioned] to his servant Baal. ... (28) No one shall commit a crime against anyone hired to work in the ships in that land.⁶⁰⁰

Aššurbanipal included the language of obedience to the king in his treaty terms, as follows:

We shall protect the king of the land of Aššur. We shall do everything that Aššurbanipal, king of Assyria, our lord, tells us to do according to his command.⁶⁰¹

The characters and symbols of authority in the DH, Moses and the *nəbî'im*, command absolute obedience from the army and the people of YHWH. They did not rely on Levantine family, kinship, and royal institutions and social structures, as noted in the following excerpts:

You will never add to the word that I command you and never diminish from it to keep the command of YHWH your *'ēlōhîm* that I command you (Deut 4:2).

He told you his covenant that he commanded you to do—the ten words—and he wrote them on two tablets of stone (Deut 4:13).

Every command that I command you today, you will guard to do so that you may live and increase and go in and possess the land that YHWH promised on oath to your fathers (Deut 8:1).

Samuel said, “Does YHWH delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as much as in obedience to the voice of YHWH. Here, obedience is better than sacrifice (1 Sam 15:22).

⁵⁹⁹ Tadmor and Yamada, *Royal Inscriptions*, 26–28.

⁶⁰⁰ Parpola and Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties*, 24–27.

⁶⁰¹ *Ibid.*, XXXII.

Samuel said to Saul, “You have acted foolishly. You did not keep the command of YHWH your god that he commanded you ... For now YHWH would have established your kingdom over Israel forever. But now your kingdom will not stand ... because you did not keep that which YHWH commanded you (1 Sam 13:13).

The Assyrian projection of power relied on bureaucratic and administrative obedience to Aššur and to the king, as the obedient servant of Aššur, both from its citizens and from its subjugated and Assyrianized rulers and their subjects. The army killed the disobedient subjects and rewarded the obedient. The system of YHWH also relied on absolute obedience from its subjects, and YHWH instructed the army and the people to kill disobedient people and to destroy rebellious cities even within their own ranks (Deuteronomy 13).

7.2.3. Enforcement and Punishment

The Assyrian and DH methods of punishment display consistency in their policies of utter devastation, killing, and deportation/exile for disobedient subjects or conquered nations. Sargon II employs the language of defeat, plunder, and deportation for the offense of rejecting the yoke of Aššur, as follows:

(20) The people of Tuḫmuna cast off the yoke of the god Aššur, and their ruler I imprisoned. (22) The people and all their property and livestock I deported and (23) settled them in the land of Ḫatti. ... (54) By command of the god Aššur, I laid a defeat on them. (67) Because of the offense, which they committed, I tore them out of their place and settled them in the land of Ḫatti and Amurru.⁶⁰²

Sennacherib goes on his first campaign to punish the Aramaeans for their disobedience, expressed in terms of lack of submissiveness, and plunders and deports them, as the following passage indicates:

Col. i (1) Sennacherib,... (20) In my first campaign, ... (49) Aramaeans were not submissive, (50) all of them I conquered. 208,000 people as heavy plunder I carried away to the land of Aššur. ... (57) The soldiers of the city of Ḫirimme, ... with weapons, I cut down. I did not spare a single one. ... (60) That region (61) I reorganized.⁶⁰³

⁶⁰² Fuchs, *Die Inschriften Sargons II*, 82–186, 313–42.

⁶⁰³ Luckenbill, *Annals of Sennacherib*, 23–47, 163–87.

Esarhaddon overwhelms and tears down the city of Sidon for its lack of fear of the lord Aššur and its disobedience to the command of his servant the king. He uses the terminology of crime to describe the offense of disobedience to Aššur's servant and to justify the total destruction of an offending kingdom, as follows:

II (65) Abdi-milkutti, king of the city of Šidon, (66) who did not fear my office of lord, did not obey the command of my lips, (67) who put his trust in the rolling sea and neglected the yoke of the god Aššur, (68) the city Šidon whose trust lay in the midst of the sea, (69) I swept over its wall like a flood and tore out its foundations, and (70) and threw it in the sea. The place of its settlement, I destroyed.⁶⁰⁴

I (1) Whoever does not keep the command of Aššur, the king of the gods, or does not fear my office of lord, ... II (18) Whoever neglects Aššur, the king of the gods, or does not obey the command of Esarhaddon, the king of the world, his lordship, ... (21) "I committed a great crime against the god Aššur because I did not obey the command of the king my lord. ... (23) The oath of the great gods, I broke." ... (25) I, Esarhaddon, great king, whose command does not change, whose princely command cannot be denied, ... (30) You did not obey the command of my lips. ... (32) You have stirred up the weapons of Aššur. ... II (33) Out of the mouth of the gods of heaven and earth, 34) came forth the destruction of your land ... (35) and was commanded the plundering of your people. IV (2) These cities, through the power [of Aššur], (3) I tore down. I demolished. I burned with fire. ... (4) By the command of Aššur my lord, I repeated.⁶⁰⁵

Aššurbanipal uses the vocabulary of breaking a treaty through forgetting and self-assurance of the offender. Such an offense justifies the total destruction of the offender and his army, as he states in the following passage:

Col. I (1) I am Aššurbanipal, ... (55) Tarqû (56) forgot the power of the god Aššur. (57) He trusted in his own strength ... (66) I called up the powerful army that the god Aššur and goddess Ištar (67) had entrusted to my hands. ... (118) These kings ... broke my treaty. (119) They did not remember the oath of the great gods. ... (132) The oath of the god Aššur, king of the gods, caught up with them

⁶⁰⁴ Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, II 65–III 19 (Episode 5).

⁶⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 102–7.

because they had offended against the treaty of (133) the great gods.
 ... (134) Now the people ... Col. II (2) I have struck down with the
 weapons; not a single man did I leave behind.⁶⁰⁶

Throughout the DH, YHWH, his *ʿābādīm* (Moses and Joshua), and the *nābîʾīm* (Moses, etc.) deliver severe punishment to enemies, kings, and people alike for disobedience to any command, as the following excerpts illustrate:

Joshua, and all Israel with him, took Achan the son of Zerah, and the silver, and the garment, and the wedge of gold, and his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his donkeys, and his sheep, and his tent, and all that he owned. They brought them unto the valley of Achor. Joshua said, "Why have you troubled us? YHWH will trouble you to-day." All Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones (Josh 7:24–25).

Samuel said to Saul, "You have blundered. You did not keep the command of YHWH your *ʾēlōhīm* that he commanded you. YHWH would have established your rule over Israel forever, but now your rule will not stand" (1 Sam 13:13–14).

Samuel said [to Saul], "Does YHWH delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as much as obeying the voice of YHWH? See here, obeying is better than sacrifice. To listen is better than the fat of rams (1 Sam 15:22).

Still YHWH did not turn away from the burning of his great anger because his anger burned against Judah because of all the anger that Manasseh had provoked in him. YHWH said, "I shall remove Judah from my presence, just as I removed Israel, and I shall reject this city" (2 Kgs 23:26–27).

The deuteronomistic covenant, as the positivist *de facto* law of the state, demanded the absolute obedience of the kings and the people, and severe punishment for infraction extended to the state itself in the end because it could not accomplish YHWH's first and most important command to clear the land of other gods and their followers. The Assyrian projection of power entailed a consistent policy of conquest and, later, annexation enforced by swift and severe punishment for crimes against the state. Just as the servants of the god Aššur obeyed their god and destroyed and deported people, who offended them or not, so the servants of YHWH attempted to follow the order for the destruction of the inhabitants of Canaan. YHWH destroyed their state, however, and sent the people into exile as punishment for not obeying his direct order.

⁶⁰⁶ Streck, *Assurbanipal*, 4–19, 66–78.

7.2.4. Imperial Military God with Universal Jurisdiction

The Assyrian emperors tolerated and respected the great gods that represented the various social, political, and economic interests of the homeland. In the vast stretches of the empire, however, and in particular under the law of annexation of Tiglath-pileser III, the supreme imperial military god Aššur held power over the other gods and the land and made war against all the other gods of other nations for the purpose of expanding the holdings of ^dAššur. Aššurnāṣirpal II claims ownership of and jurisdiction over “all the lands” by military force, the right of conquest, and the power of Aššur, as in the following passage:

(17) When Aššur, the lord, the one who called my name, he who makes my kingship great, (18) his merciless weapon in the arms of my lordship was grasped. Aššurnāṣirpal ... (19) conqueror of cities ... (21) king of kings, attentive purification priest, named by Ninurta, heroic divine weapon of the great gods, avenger, (22) king, who acts justly with the support of the gods Aššur and Šamaš, ... (23) who set all the lands at his feet. ... (27) He opposed continually the enemies of Aššur at all of their borders above and below. He imposed tribute and tax on them, the conqueror of the enemies of Aššur.⁶⁰⁷

Šalmaneser III claims his kingship over “all the peoples” by authority of Aššur, as in the following passage: (1) “Aššur, great god, king of all the great gods ... (5) Šalmaneser [III] king of all the peoples.”⁶⁰⁸

Tiglath-pileser III claims the authority of Aššur, the supreme god, the highest of the gods with universal authority over gods and land, to call up the vast armies of the land of Aššur and to strike any king or land that does not submit to Aššur’s authority, as the following excerpt illustrates:

(1) Aššur, great lord, Enlil of the gods, who decides fates, ... (3) who establishes the foundation of the land. (4) Nabû, who holds the stylus, who carries the tablet of decrees of the gods. (5) Nergal, etc. ... (21) Tiglath-pileser, governor of Enlil, prince, priest of Aššur. ... (26) king of the land of Aššur, king of the land of Šumiri. ... (32) In order to shepherd (33) the people, Aššur, the supreme god, placed him. (35) In order to strike down the unsubmissive, ... (37) I called up the vast armies of the land of Aššur.⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁷ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers I* (RIMA 2), 195. Aššurnāṣirpal II, A.0.101.20.

⁶⁰⁸ Idem, *Assyrian Rulers II* (RIMA 3), 11–24. Šalmaneser III, A.0.102.2.

⁶⁰⁹ Tadmor and Yamada, *Royal Inscriptions*, 81–83.

Sargon II, who recognizes the political importance of the Babylonian god, claims the commission and authority of both Aššur and Marduk to move the army against subject kings for their failure to pay tribute and to keep oath with the universal god Aššur. Marduk's power, however, did not include the universal authority to project power into all the lands, as in the following excerpt:

(1) He to whom Aššur and Marduk commissioned an incomparable office of king.⁶¹⁰ (68) In my fourth year of rule, Kiakki ... ignored the oath of the great gods and began to do nothing and failed to pay tribute. (69) I raised my hands to the gods, my lords, and him, his family, (70) and inhabitants, I reckoned as plunder. ... (72) Pisiri broke the oath to the great gods.⁶¹¹

Sennacherib exercises his authority and international jurisdiction as servant of the universal god Aššur, who subdued the "dark-haired people" beyond the borders of Assyria, to punish the rebellious Aramaeans and to bring them into exile in Assyria, as the following passage illustrates:

i (1) Sennacherib, great king, ... (3) wise shepherd, (4) favorite of the gods, ... (6) who goes to the assistance of the weak ... (8) who consumes (9) the disobedient ... (10) The god Aššur, ... an incomparable office of king (11) has bestowed upon me. ... (15) All the dark-haired people he subdued at my feet. ... (20) In my first campaign, ... (49) Aramaeans not submissive, (50) all of them I conquered. 208,000 people as heavy plunder I carried away to the land of Aššur.⁶¹²

Esarhaddon claims the international authority of Aššur, the king of the gods, to threaten destruction of the land of foreign states for neglecting the universal validity of the oath of Aššur, as follows:

I (1) Whoever does not keep the command of Aššur, the king of the gods, or does not fear my office of lord, ... II (18) Whoever neglects Aššur, the king of the gods, ... (23) The oath of the great gods, I broke. (33) Out of the mouth of the gods of heaven and earth, (34) came forth the destruction of your land.⁶¹³

⁶¹⁰ Fuchs, *Die Inschriften Sargons II*, 82–186, 313–342.

⁶¹¹ Ibid.

⁶¹² Luckenbill, *Annals of Sennacherib*, 23–47, 163–87.

⁶¹³ Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 102–7.

Aššurbanipal, under the international and universal authority and command of Aššur and Marduk, takes the terrifying radiance to the lands and severs the heads of those who do not submit. The mention of Marduk in this context would attest more to Aššurbanipal's solicitous attitude to the problematic local god than to the god's imperial authority. The brilliant radiance of Aššur and Ištar together overwhelm the lands. Aššurbanipal, as the "creation of Aššur," has the responsibility to enforce the command and the oath of the god in all the lands, as the following excerpt illustrates:

I mobilized my combat forces ... Upon the command of Aššur and Marduk, ... who encouraged me by ... a message of ecstasies ... I cut off the head of Teumman ... The terrifying radiance of Aššur and Ištar beat Elam down, and they submitted to my yoke.⁶¹⁴ (84) The brilliant radiance of the god Aššur and goddess Ištar overwhelmed him.⁶¹⁵

Col. I (1) I am Aššurbanipal, creation of the god Aššur, ... (18) the people of the land of the god Aššur assembled ... (20) to support me in my succession to the future (21) crown princehood of the land of the god Aššur. Oaths by the great gods (22) they swore and guaranteed the treaties. ... (66) I called up the powerful army that the god Aššur and goddess Ištar (67) had entrusted to my hands. ... (119) They did not remember the oath of the great gods. ... (132) The oath of the god Aššur, king of the gods, caught up with them because they had offended against the treaty of (133) the great gods.⁶¹⁶

Likewise the DH presupposes that a supreme imperial military god YHWH held power over all the lands and made war against all the other gods. YHWH, according to the DH, has international and universal authority, right to possession, and jurisdiction over all the lands that he promises to his people. The promise in turn relies on the presuppositions of the validity of oath agreements and the right of ownership by conquest, as the following passages illustrate:

YHWH our *ʾēlōhîm* spoke to us at Horeb. Turn and set out! Come to the mountain of the Emorites and to all their neighbors in the Arabah, in the mountain, and in the Shephalah, and in the Negeb, and in the coast of the sea, the land of the Canaanites and the Lebanon as far as the great river Euphrates. See, I have given before you the land. Go and possess the land that YHWH swore to your fathers, to

⁶¹⁴ Nissinen, *References to Prophecy*, 45.

⁶¹⁵ Streck, *Assurbanipal*, 4–19, 66–78.

⁶¹⁶ Ibid.

Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give to them and to their descendants after them! (Deut 1:6–8).

I YHWH am your *’ēlōhîm* ... You shall not have other *’ēlōhîm* in my presence (Deut 5:6–7).

When YHWH your *’ēlōhîm* gives them up before you, and you strike them, you will exterminate them completely. Do not make a treaty with them and never show them mercy! (Deut 7:2).

Should your child turn away from me and serve other gods, then the anger of YHWH will flare up against you, and he will destroy you quickly (Deut 7:4).

About forty thousand men girded up for the army passed by in front of YHWH for the war toward the plain of Jericho (Josh 4:13).

Manasseh ... set up an idol of the Asherah that he had made in the house that YHWH had said ... “In this house and in Jerusalem that I have chosen from among all the tribes of Israel, I shall set up my name forever” (2 Kgs 21:1, 7).

The oath of loyalty to YHWH thus presupposes the supremacy of YHWH over the *’ēlōhîm ’āḥērîm*. YHWH’s command to exterminate the inhabitants and their gods, as if foreigners in their own land, presupposes his universal authority over all the lands as his own possessions. YHWH terrorizes his followers by threatening to kill their children if they dare to disobey the god. YHWH led the army into the battle against the other gods and guaranteed their success depending on their acceptance of his authority and commands. The ongoing presence of the other gods before YHWH resulted in the destruction of the state.

The commands of YHWH in the DH presuppose the concept and the transcendent authority of a supreme imperial military god with universal jurisdiction to take land, to exterminate the inhabitants, and to rebuild the foreign lands to serve the god’s greater purpose. The DH god YHWH takes on the same aggressive imperial military role as Aššur in the destruction of other gods and their followers. Early in its history, the Assyrian state had allowed other local submissive gods and peoples to survive but in the long term, after Tiglath-pileser III, annexed them all in the service of Aššur. In the same way, the authors of the DH had no tolerance for other gods and their followers, who rejected the universal authority of Dtr’s god. The DH represents an imperial system that did not originate in the Levant and that even opposed and attempted to destroy the local divisive religious and political power structures.

7.2.5. Terror of the Radiance

The Assyrian emperors employ a consistent theme of a radiant and brilliant light (*melammû*) that brings the terror and fear of an overwhelming army led by an omnipotent god, as follows:

Aššurnāṣirpal II employed the radiance (*melammû*) of Aššur:

(57) *me-lam-me ša₂ aš-šur EN-ia is-ḥu-pu-šu₂-nu.*⁶¹⁷

(57) The radiance of Aššur my lord overwhelmed them.

Šalmaneser III used the terror (*pulḥi*) of the radiance (*melammû*):

(27) *pu-ul-ḥi me-lam-me ša₂ aš-šur EN-ia is-ḥu-pu.*⁶¹⁸

(27) The terror of the radiance of Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed them.

Tiglath-pileser III used radiance (*namurratu*) to inspire terror (*pulḥi*):

(11) *na-mur-rat aš-šur EN-ia is-ḥu-pu-šu₂-mu-ma.*⁶¹⁹

(11) The radiance of Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed him.

Sargon II relied on radiance (*namurratu*) to overwhelm Aššur's enemies:

(164) *na-mur-rat^d aš-šur be-li₂-ia is-ḥu-pa-šu-ma.*⁶²⁰

(164) The radiance of the god Aššur, my lord, overwhelmed him.

Sennacherib used the terrifying appearance (*rašubbat*) and the terror (*pulḥi*) of the radiance (*melammû*):

(ii 45) *ra-šub-bat GIŠ TUKUL^d aš-šur (46) EN-ia is-ḥu-pu-šu₂-nu-ti-ma*

(iii 38) *pul-ḥi me-lam-me be-lu-ti-ia is-ḥu-pu-šu₂-ma.*⁶²¹

(ii 45) The terrifying appearance of the weapon of the god Aššur, (46) my lord, overwhelmed them (iii 38). The terrifying radiance of my office of lord overwhelmed him.

Esarhaddon relied on the weapons (GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ) of the army:

*ša la-pa-an GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-ia (72) AŠ ŠEN tam-tim.*⁶²²

Who, in front of my weapons, (72) had fled to the sea.

Aššurbanipal used the brilliant radiance (*namriri*) and the radiance (*melammû*) to overwhelm the enemy:

(84) *nam-ri-ri^d aš-šur u^d INNIN is-ḥu-pu-šu-ma*

(85) *me-lam-me LUGAL-u-ti-ia ik-tu-mu-šu-ma.*⁶²³

(84) The brilliance of the god Aššur and goddess Ištar overwhelmed him. (85) The radiance of my office of king covered him.

⁶¹⁷ Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers I* (RIMA 2), 199.

⁶¹⁸ Idem, *Assyrian Rulers II* (RIMA 3), 8–10. Šalmaneser III, A.0.102.1.

⁶¹⁹ Tadmor and Yamada, *Royal Inscriptions*, 131–32.

⁶²⁰ Fuchs, *Die Inschriften Sargons II*, 82–186, 313–342.

⁶²¹ Luckenbill, *Annals of Sennacherib*, 23–47, 163–87.

⁶²² Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, II 65–III 19 (Episode 5).

⁶²³ Streck, *Assurbanipal*, 4–19, 66–78.

The word *me-lam-me* (terrifying brilliance; *Schreckensglanz*) may derive from Sumerian *me.lam₂*, which may signify the terrifying brilliance of “a hundred fires” of perhaps an army camp or a burning city.⁶²⁴ Šalmaneser III calls *na-mu-rat* GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-ia, “the terror-inspiring radiance of my furious weapons.” However one translates or understands the terms for the terrifying radiance, it had a consistent power throughout the Neo-Assyrian age, at least in the rhetoric of the emperors, to inspire fear and terror in Assyrian enemies.

The authors of the DH portray YHWH in a similar imagery of terror and fear accompanied by overwhelming light, radiance, flame, and lightning, as in the following passages:

’āḥēl tēt paḥdākā wə-yir’ātākā ‘al-pənē hā’ammîm (Deut 2:25).

I shall begin to give terror of you and fear of you before all the nations.

Wə-kî-nāpākāh ’ēmatkem ‘ālēnû wə-kî nāmōgû kol-yōšbē hā-’āreṣ mippānēkem (Josh 2:9).

Terror of you has fallen upon us, and all the inhabitants of the land faint before you.

Lə-ma’an da’at kol-’ammē hā-’āreṣ ’et-yad yhwh kî ḥāzāqāh hî lə-ma’an yārā’tem ’et-yhwh ’ēlōhēkem kol-hay-yāmîm (Josh 4:24).

So that all the nations of the land know the hand of YHWH that it is strong and so that you fear YHWH your *’ēlōhîm* all the days.

’im-tîr’û ’et-yhwh wa-’abadtem ’ōtô û-šəma’tem baqōlô wə-lō’ tamrû ’et-pî yhwh wihiyitem gam-’attem wə-gam-ham-melek ’āšer mālak ‘ālēkem ‘aḥar yhwh ’ēlōhēkem (1 Sam 12:14).

If you fear YHWH and serve him and you hear his voice and do not rebel against the mouth/command of YHWH, then you and also the king ruling over you will be following YHWH your *’ēlōhîm*.

Min-nōgah negdô bā’ārû gaḥālê-’ēš yar’ēm min-šāmayim yhwh wə-’elyôn yitten qōlô way-yiślah ḥiṣṣîm wa-yipîšēm bārāq wa-yhūmmēm way-yāhōm (2 Sam 22:13–14).

From the brightness before him, coals of fire flamed forth. YHWH thundered from heaven, the most high uttered his voice. He sent out arrows and scattered them, and lightning routed them.

môšēl bā-’ādām ṣaddîq môšēl yir’at ’ēlōhîm. û-kə’ôr bōqer yizraḥ-šemeš bōqer lō’ ‘ābôt minnōgāh mimmāṭāh deše’ mē-’āreṣ (2 Sam 23:3–4).

⁶²⁴ Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*, 440.

One who rules the just man, one who rules the fear of *ʾēlōhîm*—is like the light of morning, the rising of the sun, a morning without clouds, from its brightness from the rain on the grass of the land.

lā-maʿan yirāʾûkā kol-hay-yāmîm ʾāšer-hēm ḥayyîm ʿal-pānê hā-ʾādāmāh ʾāšer nātattāh laʾābōtênû (1 Kgs 8:40).

So that they will fear you all the days that they live on the face of the land that you gave to our fathers.

kî ʾim-ʾet-yhwh ʾēlōhêkem tîrāʾû wā-hûʾ yaššîl ʾetkem miyyad kol-ʾōyābêkem (2 Kgs 17:39).

Because if you will fear YHWH your *ʾēlōhîm*, then he will save you from your enemies.

The DH thus presents YHWH of Jerusalem as having the same overwhelming radiant power by reputation—at first as an overwhelming army then as flashing brilliant light or lightning—to inspire fear and terror among his enemies and followers alike.

7.3. Summary and Hypotheses

This study began by asking which law the people of YHWH had broken to deserve national death and deportation/exile. It acknowledged the work of scholars in identifying the presence of multiple authors or redactors in the DH—Dtr, DtrG, DtrP, DtrN, DtrL, Dtr₁, and Dtr₂ among others—and the debate about the dates of composition and redaction. Scholars within that debate—Otto, Römer, Knauf—identified elements of the DH consistent with Assyrian influence, and following Steymans, this study proposes another redactor perhaps designated DtrVTE (translator of the VTE).

The study continued with a close reading of the DH as a whole that revealed a consistent and clear pattern of the elemental constituents of a Dtr covenant between YHWH, the kings, and the people. Although the DtrN (*tôrāh*) redactor promoted obedience to the “law” codes within the book of Deuteronomy, the combined narrative of the other DH redactors paid no attention to those codes of instruction and depicted instead an imperial law that consisted of command from YHWH and the life or death necessity of obeying it. The study then hypothesized that a positivist definition of the law distinguished between law by code and law by command. The law of direct command of YHWH and the *nābîʾîm* remained the sole law in effect and enforced by the supreme authorities of the state, the *nābîʾîm*, who controlled even the kings. The study hypothesized that this enforced, hence legal, Dtr covenant consisted of the declaration of war against the other gods and their followers, absolute military-style obedience to the *nābîʾîm*, and capital punishment for disobedience. The covenant carried a presupposition of a god with universal authority and jurisdiction over the lands and a warrant to conquer and to de-

stroy opposition. It presupposed the legality of ownership by conquest through the means of force, intimidation, or terror.

After a detailed study of the common society and culture of Levantine city-kingdoms through their extant literature and treaties from the late-second and early-first millennium B.C.E., the study hypothesized that a military imperial covenant like that of the DH could not have developed either from the humble origins of the hill country of Judah through evolution of patrimonial kingdoms or from the small Levantine, Phoenician and Canaanite city kingdoms that relied on mutual trade and defense for their survival. The study pursued the lead of the imperial Hittite treaties from the mid-second millennium B.C.E. and discovered that although common imperial principles did appear, the inclusive empire of Ḫattuša did not profess a single universal god and did not destroy but rather collected other gods. Although the Hittites deported vast numbers of prisoners of war into their homeland to replace their troops depleted by constant imperial warfare, they did not attempt to annihilate and repopulate whole regions with loyal servants. The study hypothesized that a direct cultural link between Ḫattuša and Jerusalem appeared not plausible given the differences in principle and the vast distances between them in time and place.

Following the lead of Otto, Römer, and Knauf, the study surveyed the scholarship concerning Assyria in the first millennium B.C.E. and then the extant imperial inscriptions of the kings of the Neo-Assyrian empire. The imperial inscriptions functioned to state in public the ideology of the empire and the compliance of the king in expanding the borders of Aššur's holy land. This survey found evidence of an empire engaged in an unprecedented projection of power under the aegis of a single universal military god. The empire declared and made war against other gods and states that resisted it. Under Tiglath-pileser III's law of annexation, even cooperative states received passive annihilation in the form of total assimilation by means of repopulation, reeducation, and renaming. The empire imposed capital punishment, by death or exile, on an individual or country that disobeyed its commands. The military imperial administrative structure relied on personal oathtaking and obedience to the central command. The central military command, which focused on the king, had an empire-wide intelligence system that relied on the communication and information skills of a class of scribes. The scribes controlled and reported information from the far reaches of the empire to the king and the military commanders. The god of the scribes, Nabû, held a high place in the Assyrian pantheon next to the imperial god Aššur, and the servants of Nabû (*ardû Nabû* or *Nabî*) held a similar high position next to the king as his trusted military and political advisers.

The study then surveyed the inscriptions and extant treaties of the Levant of the first millennium under the influence of the Neo-Assyrian empire and found that their outlook on their own powers and their relations with their neighbors had changed. The subjugated states had reacted with various

means to cope with the empire, but the majority had set forth state-level inscriptions describing aggressive new military imperial agendas. This study hypothesizes that the new tendency of the small states to claim to have superior gods with local dominance stems from their close experience with the ideology of the imperial forces of the empire. Scholars tend to view the Meša^c inscription as an independent Levantine example of the practice of *herem* or extermination of a population in the service of a god. For example, Keel writes, “The Mesha Stele of Moab (ninth cent. B.C.E.) attests to the killing (*herem*) of the defeated peoples and the consecration of their land to the Moabite god.”⁶²⁵ In view, however, of the imperial policies of Aššur-našir-apli II and Šalmaneser III throughout the ninth century B.C.E. all around the land of Moab—the systematic extermination of stubborn enemies by means of massacre, execution, plunder, deportation, occupation, and eventual loss of national identity—Meša^c and his scribes must have known about these imperial policies, strategies, and rhetoric of the Assyrians. According to Vera Chamaza, Meša^c kept away from involvement in the Damascus coalition because he would have known that resistance to Šalmaneser III carried heavy consequences. In describing the minor, local imperialist ventures of Meša^c, his scribes used some of the same tropes that the *ummiānū* of the land of Aššur had used at the same time to describe the campaigns of Aššur-našir-apli II and Šalmaneser III during the mid-ninth century B.C.E.⁶²⁶ The Meša^c inscription, therefore, may not represent an independent Levantine development of imperialist aggression or of the practice of *herem*.

The study returned to Jerusalem in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. and surveyed the scholarship with respect to its interaction with the Assyrian empire. The close reading and analysis of the DH, the hypothesis of an imperial deuteronomistic covenant, and the exclusion of local or Hittite influence, provided a new perspective from which to view the phenomenon. The analysis of the enforced policies of the empire as law by positivist definition, with Tiglath-pileser III’s law of annexation in mind, make possible the general hypothesis that the writers of the DH adapted that specific imperial law and its principles to their local situation. That such a revolutionary concept of imperial projection of power in the actions of war, obedience, deportation, and terror from a universal god, who claimed the whole world as his domain, could have arisen from tribal hill folk or even from a Levantine Canaanite city environment does not appear plausible. What Otto calls a fundamentalist religious rebellion came not from pristine village folk returning to the old ways of living from cisterns and terraces on the isolated hillsides of Judah but from the empire. It represents a deep absorption and adaptation of the imperial values and ideology to the situation in Jerusalem.

⁶²⁵ Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems*, 573 (my translation).

⁶²⁶ Vera Chamaza, *Die Rolle Moabs*, 56–59.

This hypothesis about the nature of the Dtr covenant depends both upon its correspondence in principle and on further hypotheses concerning the nature of the law, the authors of the DH, and YHWH. Although scholarship has not referred to the annexation policy of Tiglath-pileser III as law, this study applies the positivist definition of law to that policy because the administrative and military bureaucracy of the state enforced it. Annexation meant that the army followed the god's command to destroy the cities, kill resistant populations, deport or otherwise annihilate the remaining populations, reconstruct and repopulate the landscape in imperial style, install a governor and garrisons, and impose uniform taxation, conscription, measures, and language. The god projected overwhelming military power both on the home front and in the form of a political imperial model of unitary and universal jurisdiction to transform the world. The law of annexation aimed at transforming land into productive service of the army of the god. It required a centralized imperial and military administration organized around a universal supreme god. This study hypothesizes that these elements fit into the DH ideology. The plan of YHWH of the DH failed, however, because the people had disobeyed the first and most important command to exterminate the people and their gods from the land despite the rhetoric of the conquest. This proposal takes the study back to its original question: Which law did the people break? This study hypothesizes that by disobeying the direct order of YHWH and the *nābî* Moses, the people broke the imperial law of command and the Dtr equivalent of Tiglath-pileser III's law of annexation.

This study proposes for further study the possibility that the class of *nābî'im* scribes composed the DH and that they learned from the Assyrian class of scribes their task of controlling information, communication, and writing propaganda. Although the DH does not emphasize the role of the *nābî'im* as scribes, they did not play the role of diviners or fortune-tellers in the DH as the translation *προφήτης* suggests. Their role resembled rather that of authoritative leaders and shapers of the nation, who advised the kings and the people to avoid diviners. This role resembles and may derive from that of the literate scribes of Assyria, who controlled the information and communications of the empire. The scribes, associated with the god Nabû, wrote down the information associated with the operation of the empire from the large scale to the small. Such skilled people could have had a peripheral title of *arad* or *ardat Nabû*, which could have assumed the form of *arad*, *ardû*, or *ardātu Nabî* in its journey to the periphery through Aramaic. The title fits with the concept of *nabî* (the one called or named) by the god, because of their intellectual capacity for scribal work, high position in the court, and superior knowledge of the facts. The *nābî'im* knew the mind of YHWH in the same way that the *ardû* or *ardātu Nabû/î* knew, by means of their vast intelligence system, the detailed facts of the empire. They would have appeared god-like in their ability to advise the king in the name of the god.

DH scholars have noted the prominent role played by the *nabî'im* in the DH. Jepsen's prophetic, *nebiistischen* redactor (R^{II}) resembles Noth's Dtr author.⁶²⁷ DtrP (*nabî'im*) uses the unfortunate Greek misnomer "προφήτης" but assigns an important role to the *nabî'im*. Dtr as a whole promoted a system in which the king submitted to YHWH's authority as determined by the *nabî'im*. The exemplary kings—David, Hezekiah, and Josiah—recognized the authority of the *nabî'im* and followed their commands from YHWH.⁶²⁸

Concerning the morphology of this term, *nabî'*, John Huehnergard writes, "usually personal names, even those ending in *-um*, are indeclinable: e.g., *ana Aḫum* (for *Aḫum*) (vs. *ana aḫim* "for the brother"); there are many exceptions, however."⁶²⁹ Thus one would not expect a form like *arad Nabî*. Exceptions do occur, however, as Neo-Assyrian has "two cases in the singular, viz. nominative-accusative (ending in *-u*) and (genitive ending in *-i*). ... Compounds with the determinative pronoun *ša* are very common, e.g. ½ MA.NA *ina ša* KA₂.DINGIR.KI (SAA I 51:9 *ša-Bābili* "the standard of Babylon").⁶³⁰ The ending **-m* disappeared early in PNWS and does not occur in a NWS dialect (thus, *kalbu* / *kalbi* / *kalba*).⁶³¹ The passage of the term through Aramaic could explain the presence of the *'aleph*, since, "the construct state implies determination: מִלְתָּ מֶלֶךְ (the word of the king)."⁶³² Cognates with the Hebrew word *nābî'* indicate that it could refer to "the one called" from the Akkadian *nabû* G verb "to name; to appoint."⁶³³ The Semitic root *n-b-*, "to name, proclaim," does not occur in Hebrew in the G stem, and the Niphal and Hithpael forms have a denominative sense meaning "to act like a *nābî'*." Huehnergard concludes, from an examination of a Mari text (LU₂ *na-bi-i meš ša ḥa-na meš*) (ca. 1780–1759 B.C.E.) and from Hebrew morphology and semantics, that the noun *nābî'* has the passive meaning "the one called, named" by a god as in Old Babylonian *ḥa-am-mu-ra-pi na-bi-u₃ AN-nim* (Ḥammurabi the one named/called by Anum; ca. 1759 B.C.E.). Given the ancient provenances of these examples, however, Huehnergard's analysis does not preclude a more contemporaneous connection of the *nābî'* to the scribes, *arad* or *ardū Nabî*, and the scribal god, Nabû, of the empire. This present study hypothesizes this connection as a topic brought up by this study and worthy of further investigation.

The presupposition of a universal god with authority and jurisdiction over lands and a warrant to destroy opposition and the accompanying presupposition of the legality of conquest by force or by intimidation and terror has

⁶²⁷ Weippert, "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk," 228.

⁶²⁸ Geoghegan, *Time*, 139–40.

⁶²⁹ Huehnergard, *Grammar of Akkadian*, 113.

⁶³⁰ Hämeen-Anttila, *Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar*, 77, 80.

⁶³¹ Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar of Classical Hebrew*, 22.

⁶³² Rosenthal, *Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 29.

⁶³³ Huehnergard, "On the Etymology and Meaning of Hebrew *nābî'*," 88–93.

precedent in Assyria. It supports the argument that Dtr could have composed the DH in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. under the subjugation of the Assyrian empire, which brought it to Jerusalem. It weakens the argument that Dtr did not learn of a universal and imperial god from the much later Persian empire.

This study hypothesizes that the Dtr authors, the *nəbî'im*, composed the bulk of the DH in Jerusalem during the Exile₁ period (732–587 B.C.E.) and, later in the Exile₂ period in Babylon, expressed their guilt for failure. Exilic conditions existed in Jerusalem for 245 years (732–587 B.C.E.) when the Jerusalem elite lived with refugees from Samaria in exile in their own land surrounded by local Canaanites and after 701 B.C.E. by Assyrian deportees, who did not share their vision of a local imperial god. This hypothesis means that references to exilic conditions that occur throughout the DH, and according to some scholars, provide evidence of late composition of the work, do not refer to the Babylonian exile. Such references may constitute later editing of earlier texts, but specific references to the Babylonian exile do not occur until the final chapters of 2 Kings.

The LXX gave the book of *'ēlleh had-dəbārîm* (These are the Words) the title Δευτερονόμιον “second law” because the book reveals a change in the law characterized by centralization. As the present study has observed, this change went far beyond centralization of the cult and the dynasty in Jerusalem. The second law acknowledges the ten words on stone but ignores them in the working out of the nation’s subsequent history. The second law bears more resemblance to Tiglath-pileser III’s imperial law of annexation. To make this connection, the present study redefined the accepted concept of law in DH scholarship. What scholarship refers to as “law” (*tôrāh*), refers to a code of instruction in social, cultic, and juridical rules, which plays no significant part in the fate of the nation except where it follows the imperial law. This study employed the positivist concept of law as that rule or set of rules that a state enforces. A god that enforces such a military imperial law could not have developed unassisted from a small Phoenician and Canaanite city with Levantine traditions and values. Thus this study hypothesizes that the DH and the deuteronomistic covenant mark the historical transformation of a local Phoenician and Canaanite god and state into a military imperial god and state modeled after the image of the god Aššur and the Neo-Assyrian empire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abou-Assaf, Ali, Pierre Bordreuil, and Alan R. Millard, *La statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne*. Études Assyriologiques. Paris: Éditions recherche sur les civilisations, 1982.
- Ackerman, Susan. "At Home with the Goddess." Pages 455–68 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*. Edited by William G. Dever and S. Gitin. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Albertz, Rainer. "In Search of the Deuteronomists: A First Solution to a Historical Riddle." Pages 1–18 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Thomas Römer. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 147. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- . "Why a Reform like Josiah's Must Have Happened." Pages 27–46 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. London: T&T Clark International, 2005.
- Altman, Amnon. "Rethinking the Hittite System of Subordinate Countries from the Legal Point of View." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123 (2003) 741–56.
- . *The Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties: An Inquiry into the Concepts of Hittite Interstate Law*. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2004.
- Amit, Yairah. "The Book of Judges: Fruit of 100 Years of Creativity." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9:17 (2009) 28–35. Online: www.jhsonline.org.
- Archi, Alfonso. *Hethitische Briefe und Texte verschiedenen Inhalts*. Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi. Heft 57. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Zentralinstitut für Alte Geschichte und Archäologie. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987.
- Arnaud, Daniel. "Les ports de la 'Phénicie' à la fin de l'âge du Bronze Récent (XIV–XIII siècles) d'après les textes cunéiformes de Syrie." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 30 (1992) 181–94.
- Bär, Jürgen. *Der assyrische Tribut und seine Darstellung. Eine Untersuchung zur imperialen ideologie im neuassyrischen Reich*. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996.
- Barré, Michael L. "Treaties in the Ancient Near East." Page 6:653 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Beal, Richard H. "The Ten Year Annals of Great King Muršili II of Ḫatti (2.16)." Pages 2:82–90 in *The Context of Scripture*. 3 vols. Edited by William W. Hallo. New York: Brill, 1997–2002.
- . "The Hittites after the Empire's Fall." *Biblical Illustrator* (1983) 28–37.

- Beckman, Gary. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Edited by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. Writings from the Ancient World, Society of Biblical Literature 7. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1996.
- Binger, Tilde. *Asherah: Goddesses in Ugarit, Israel and the Old Testament*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 232. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Black, Jeremy, Andrew George, and Nicholas Postgate. *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*. SANTAG 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.
- Borger, Riekele. *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien*. Graz: Im Selbstverlage des Herausgebers, 1956.
- . *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 305. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004.
- Brinkman, John A. "Sennacherib's Babylonian Problem: An Interpretation." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 20 (1973) 89–95.
- . "Political Covenants, Treaties, and Loyalty Oaths in Babylonia and between Assyrian and Babylonia." Pages 81–111 in *I trattati nel mondo antico. Forma, ideologia, funzione*. Edited by Luciano Canfora, Mario Liverani, and Carlo Zaccagnini. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1990.
- . "Through a Glass Darkly: Esarhaddon's Retrospects on the Downfall of Babylon." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103 (1983) 35–42.
- British Museum Collection Database. "358242" www.britishmuseum.org/collection. British Museum, last modified 23 January 2010. Online. Accessed 18 February 2011.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.
- Bryce, Trevor. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Buccellati, Giorgio. *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria: An Essay on Political Institutions with Special Reference to the Israelite Kingdoms*. Studi Semitici 26. Rome: Istituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente, Università di Roma, 1967.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis and L. W. King, eds. *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*. Vol. 1. London: Harrison & Sons, 1902.
- Buhl, Marie-Louise. "Hamath." Pages 3.33–36 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Carruba, Onofrio. "Beiträge zur mittelhethitischen Geschichte. I—Die Tuthalijas und die Arnuwandas." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 18. Inculabula Graeca 63, Fascicolo 18 (1977) 137–74. KUB xxiii, 27.
- Charpin, Dominique. "The History of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Overview." Pages 807–29 in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Jack M. Sasson. 4 vols. New York: Scribner, 1995.

- Cogan, Mordechai. *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah, and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974.
- Coggins, Richard. "What Does 'Deuteronomistic' Mean?" Pages 22–35 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by Linda S. Shearing and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplemental Series 268. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Cohen, Chaim. "Neo-Assyrian Elements in the First Speech of the Biblical *Rab-šāqê*." *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979) 32–48.
- Coogan, Michael D., ed. *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Davies, Philip R. "Josiah and the Law Book." Pages 65–77 in *Good Kings and Bad Kings*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. London: T & T Clark International, 2005.
- Day, John. "Asherah." Pages 1:483–87 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Dearman, J. Andrew. "Historical Reconstruction of the Mesha' Inscription." Pages 155–210 in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Edited by idem. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1989.
- Dietrich, Walter. *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 108. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- . "Vielfalt und Einheit im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk." Pages 169–83 in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*. Edited by Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Dion, Paul-Eugene. "Deuteronomium 28 und die *adê* zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons: Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel." *Biblica* 78 (1997) 271–75.
- Donner, H. and W. Röllig. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966.
- Dubovsky, Peter, S.J. *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies: Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Intelligence Services and Its Significance for 2 Kings 18–19*. *Biblica et Orientalia* 49. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.
- Dworkin, R. M. "Is Law a System of Rules?" Pages 38–65 in *The Philosophy of Law*. Edited by R. M. Dworkin. Oxford Readings in Philosophy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

- Ehelolf, Hans. "Text of Labarna." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 9 (1936) 170–95.
- Eidem, J. "An Old Assyrian Treaty from Tell Leilan." Pages 185–208 in *Marchands, diplomats et empereurs. Études sur la civilisation Mésopotamienne offertes à Paul Garelli*. Edited by Dominique Charpin and F. Joannès. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1991.
- Fales, Frederick M., ed., *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis*. Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente, Centro per le antichità e la storia dell'arte del vicino Oriente, 1981.
- . "Le double bilinguisme de la statue de Tell Fekherye." *Syria* 60 (1983) 233–50.
- Finkelstein, Israel. "City-States to States: Polity Dynamics in the 10th–9th Centuries B.C.E." Pages 75–83 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*. Proceedings of the Centennial Symposium, W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and American Schools of Oriental Research, 2000, Jerusalem. Edited by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- . "Digging for the Truth: Archaeology and the Bible." Pages 19–20 in *The Quest for the Historical Israel: Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel*. Edited by Brian B. Schmidt. SBL Archaeology and Biblical Studies 17. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Finkelstein, Israel and N. A. Silberman. *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New View of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts*. New York: Free Press, 2001.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*. Rev. ed. Biblical et Orientalia 19/A. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1995.
- Forrer, Emil. "The Hittites in Palestine, I." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* (1936) 190–203.
- Foster, Benjamin R. "Water under the Straw: Peace in Mesopotamia." Pages 66–80 in *War and Peace in the Ancient World*. Edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2007.
- Frankena, R. "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy." *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 14 (1965) 122–54.
- Friedrich, Johannes. *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. Hethitische Texte in Umschrift, mit Übersetzung und Erläuterungen, Heft 4. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft (E.V.) 34. Band 1. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1930.
- Fuchs, Andreas. *Die Inschriften Sargons II. Aus Khorsabad*. Göttingen: Cuvillier, 1994.
- Galil, Gershon. Khirbet Qeiyafa Archaeological Project. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 7 January 2010. Online: <http://qeiyafa.huji.ac.il/ostracon2.asp>. http://humweb.ucsc.edu/gweltaz/courses/intro_judaism/qeiyafa_ostracon.html

- Gallagher, William R. *Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah: New Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Genge, Heinz. *Stelen neuassyrischer Könige. Eine Dokumentation und philologische Vorarbeit zur Würdigung einer archäologischen Denkmälergattung*. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1965.
- Geoghegan, Jeffrey C. *The Time, Place, and Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History: The Evidence of "Until This Day."* Brown Judaic Studies 347. Providence, R.I.: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.
- Gibson, John C. L. *Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions*. Vol. 1 of *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- . *Aramaic Inscriptions*. Vol. 2 of *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- . *Phoenician Inscriptions*. Vol. 3 of *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- . "The Mythological Texts." Pages 193–202 of *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Bd. 39. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Gonnet, Hatice. "Hittite Religion." Translated by Stephen Rosoff. Pages 3:225–28 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Götze, Albrecht. *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*. Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen ägyptischen Gesellschaft, Bd. 38. Hethitische Texte, Heft 6. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1938.
- Grayson, Albert Kirk. "Assyrian Civilization." Pages 194–228 in *The Assyrian and Babylonian Empires and Other States of the Near East, from the Eighth to the Sixth Centuries B.C.* Vol. 3, part 2 of *The Cambridge Ancient History*. 2d ed. Edited by John Boardman et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- . *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC I (1114–859 BC)*. The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 2. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- . *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BC)*. The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Green, Douglas J. "I Undertook Great Works." *The Ideology of Domestic Achievements in West Semitic Royal Inscriptions*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Gurney, Oliver R. "The Hittite Empire." Pages 151–65 in *Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires*. Edited by Mogens T. Larsen. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979.

- . *The Hittites*. 2d ed. London: Penguin, 1990.
- Gurney, O. R. and J. J. Finkelstein, *The Sultantepe Tablets*. 2 vols. Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 3, 7. London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1957–1964.
- Güterbock, Hans Gustav. “Hittite Religion.” Pages 83–109 in *Forgotten Religions (Including Some Living Primitive Religions)*. Edited by Vergilius Ferm. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950.
- . “The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by His Son, Mursili II,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 10 (1956) 41–68, 75–98, 107–30. Online: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1359041>. Accessed 17 January 2011.
- Haas, Volkert. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten. Bd. 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Hallo, William W., ed. *The Context of Scripture*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Hämeen-Anttila, Jaakko. *A Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar*. State Archives of Assyria Studies 13. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2000.
- Hamilton, Mark W. “The Past as Destiny: Historical Visions in Sam’al and Judah under Assyrian Hegemony.” *Harvard Theological Review* 91 (1998) 215–50.
- Harvey, John. “The Structure of the Deuteronomistic History.” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 20 (2006) 237–58.
- Held, Warren H., Jr., William R. Schmalstieg, and Jenat E. Gertz. *Beginning Hittite*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1987.
- Heltzer, Michael. “The Economy of Ugarit.” Pages 423–54 of *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 39. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Hoffmann, Hans-Detlef. *Reform und Reformen. Untersuchungen zu einem Grundthema der deuteronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 66. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. “Some Contributions of Hittitology to Old Testament Study.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 20 (1969) 27–55.
- . “Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites.” *Orientalia* 49 (1980) 283–332.
- . “Hittites.” Pages 127–55 in *Peoples of the Old Testament World*. Edited by Alfred J. Hoerth, Gerald L. Mattingly, and Edwin M. Yamauchi. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1996.
- . “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma (1.74).” Pages 1:185–92 in *The Context of Scripture*. Edited by William W. Hallo. 3 volumes. New York: Brill, 1997.
- . “Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar (1.72).” Pages 1:182–84 in *ibid.*

- . “Hittite-Israelite Cultural Parallels.” Pages xxix–xxxiv in *Archival Documents from the Biblical World*. Vol. 3 of *The Context of Scripture*. Edited by William W. Hallo. 3 vols. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Holladay, John S. “The Kingdoms of Israel and Judah: Political and Economic Centralization in the Iron IIA-B (ca. 1000–750 B.C.E.).” Pages 368–98 in *The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land*. Edited by Thomas E. Levy. London: Leicester University Press, 1998.
- Holloway, Steven W. *Aššur is King! Aššur is King!: Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. “History of Warfare according to Hittite Sources: The Annals of Hattusilis I (Part II).” *Anatolica* 11 (1984) 48–53.
- . “Hittite History.” *Anchor Biblical Dictionary* 3:219–25.
- Huehnergard, John. *A Grammar of Akkadian*. Harvard Semitic Museum Studies 45. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1997.
- Huehnergard, John. “On the Etymology and Meaning of Hebrew *nābîʾ*.” Pages 88–93 in *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies* 26. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1999.
- Huehnergard, John and Aaron D. Rubin. “Phyla and Waves: Models of Classification.” Pages 259–78 in *Semitic Languages: An International Handbook on their Structure, their History, and their Investigation*. Handbücher zur Sprachund Kommunikationswissenschaft. Edited by Michael P. Streck and Stefan Weninger in collaboration with Geoffrey Khan and Janet Watson. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012.
- Jamieson-Drake, David W. *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archaeological Approach*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplemental Series. Sheffield: Almond, 1991.
- Jepsen, Alfred. *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1956.
- Jong, Matthijs J. de. *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets: A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies*. Supplements to the Vetus Testamentum 117. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Keel, Othmar. *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus*. Teil 1. Orte und Landschaften der Bible 4/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- Kempinski, Aharon. “Hittites in the Bible: What Does Archaeology Say?” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 5 (1979) 20–45.
- Kestemont, Guy. “Le traite entre Mursil II de Hatti et Niqmepa d’Ugarit.” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 6 (1974) 85–127.
- Khirbet Qeiyafa Archaeological Project. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 7 January 2010. Online: <http://qeiyafa.huji.ac.il/ostracon2.asp>. http://humweb.ucsc.edu/gweltaz/courses/intro_judaism/qeyafa_ostracon.html.

- Kitchen, Kenneth A. *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*. London: Tyndale, 1966.
- . *Bible in Its World: The Bible and Archaeology Today*. Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity, 1978.
- Klengel, Horst. *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1. Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Bd. 34. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Kletter, Raz. "Pots and Politics: Material Remains of Late Iron Age Judah in Relation to its Political Borders." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 314 (1999) 19–54.
- Knauf, Ernst Axel. "Does 'Deuteronomistic Historiography' (DtrH) Exist?" Pages 388–98 in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Edited by Thomas Römer and Jean-Daniel Macchi. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 306. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Kühne, Cord and Heinrich Otten. *Der Šaušgamusa-Vertrag*. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1971.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. *The Ancient Near East, c. 3000–330 BC*. 2 vols. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Lambdin, Thomas O. and John Huehnergard. *The Historical Grammar of Classical Hebrew: An Outline*. Cambridge, Mass., 1998.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*. 7th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Liverani, Mario. "The Ideology of the Assyrian Empire." Pages 297–317 in *Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires*. Edited by M. T. Larsen. Mesopotamia 7. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979.
- . "The Impact of the Assyrian Empire (c. 740–640)." Pages 143–64 in idem, *Israel's History and the History of Israel*. Translated by Chiara Peri and Philip R. Davies. Oakville, Conn.: DBBC, 2005.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Kerygmata des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks." Pages 87–100 in *Die Botschaft und die Boten. Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Jörg Jeremias und Lothar Perlitt. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.
- Luckenbill, Daniel David. *The Annals of Sennacherib*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924.
- Machinist, Peter. "Assyrians on Assyria in the First Millennium B.C." Pages 77–104 in *Anfänge politischen Denkens in der Antike. Die nahöstlichen Kulturen und die Griechen*. Edited by Kurt Raaflaub and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner. München: R. Oldenbourg, 1993.

- . “Administration of (Assyro-Babylonian) Palestine.” Pages 69–81 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. Vol. 5. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Macqueen, James G. “The History of Anatolia and of the Hittite Empire: An Overview.” Pages 1085–1105 in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Jack Sasson. 4 vols. New York: Scribner, 1995.
- Maier, Walter A. III, “Anath.” Pages 1:225–27 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Malbran-Labat, Florence. *L’armée et l’organisation militaire de l’Assyrie. D’après les lettres des Sargonides trouvées à Ninive*. Hautes études orientales 19. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1982.
- Margalit, Baruch. “The Legend of Keret.” Pages 203–33 of *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 39. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Mattingly, Gerald L. “Moabite Religion and the Mesha‘ Inscription.” Pages 211–38 in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Edited by idem. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1989.
- Mayer, Ruth. “Die Hethiter und das Alte Testament.” Pages 65–73 in *Mysterium der Gnade*. Edited by H. Rossmann. Regensburg: Pustet, 1975.
- Mayes, Andrew D. H. *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History*. London: SCM, 1983.
- Mazar, Amihai. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible, 10,000–586 B.C.E.* Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Mazar, Eilat. “Royal Gateway to Ancient Jerusalem Uncovered.” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 15:03 (May/Jun 1989). Online: <http://www.basarchive.org.ezpprod1.hul.harvard.edu/bswbSearch.asp>.
- . “What did David’s Palace Look Like?” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 23:01 (Jan/Feb 1997). Online: <http://www.basarchive.org.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/bswbSearch.asp>.
- . “Did I Find David’s Palace?” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 32:01 (Jan/Feb 2006) 16–70.
- McCarter P. Kyle, Jr. “The Apology of David.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980) 489–504.
- McCarthy, Dennis J., S.J. *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1978.
- McKenzie, Steven L. “Deuteronomistic History.” Pages 2:160–68 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . “The Divided Kingdom in the Deuteronomistic History and in Scholarship on It.” Pages 135–46 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by

- Thomas Römer. *Biblioteca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium* 147. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- . “The Trouble with Kingship.” Pages 286–314 in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Edited by Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 306. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- . “A Response to Thomas C. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*.” *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9:17 (2009) 15–21. Online: www.jhsonline.org.
- McMahon, Gregory. “Hittites in the OT.” Page 3:232 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . “Hittite Texts and Literature.” Pages 3:228–31 in *ibid*.
- Melchert, H. Craig. “The Acts of Hattušili I.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 37 (1978) 1–22. Online: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/544291>.
- Mendenhall, George E. “Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition.” *The Biblical Archaeologist* 17 (1954) 50–76.
- Mendenhall, George E. and Gary A. Herion. “Covenant.” Pages 1:1179–1202 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Meyers, Carol. “Material Remains and Social Relations: Women’s Culture in Agrarian Households of the Iron Age.” Pages 425–44 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*. Proceedings of the Centennial Symposium, W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and American Schools of Oriental Research, 2000, Jerusalem. Edited by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Misgav, Haggai, Y. Garfinkel, and S. Ganor. “The Ostrakon.” Pages 243–57 in *Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 1. Excavation Report 2007–2008*. Edited by Y. Garfinkel and S. Ganor. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2009.
- Moran, William L. “The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 25 (1963) 77–87.
- Morrow, William S. “Cuneiform Literacy and Deuteronomic Composition.” *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 62 (2005) 204–13.
- Na’aman, Nadav. “Royal Inscriptions and the Histories of Joash and Ahaz, Kings of Judah.” *Vetus Testamentum* 48 (1998) 333–49.
- . “Solomon’s District List (1 Kings 4:7–19) and the Assyrian Province System in Palestine.” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 33 (2001) 419–36.
- . *Canaan in the Second Millennium B.C.E.: Collected Essays*. Vol. 2. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

- . *Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors: Interaction and Counteraction. Collected Essays*. Vol. 1. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- . *Ancient Israel's History and Historiography: The First Temple Period. Collected Essays*. Vol. 3. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- . "The Temple Library of Jerusalem and the Composition of the Book of Kings." Pages 129–52 in *Congress Volume Leiden 2004*. Edited by André Lemaire. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Na'aman, Nadav and Ran Zadok. "Assyrian Deportations to the Province of Samerina in the Light of Two Cuneiform Tablets from Tel Hadid." *Tel Aviv* 27 (2000) 159–88.
- Nagy, Gregory. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concept of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Rev. ed. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Nelson, Richard D. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 18. Sheffield, England: JSOT, 1981.
- . "A Response to Thomas C. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9:17 (2009) 5–14. Online: www.jhsonline.org.
- Neu, Erich. *Der Anitta-Text*. Studien zu den Bogazköy 18; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974.
- Nicholson, E. W. "Covenant in a Century of Study since Wellhausen." Pages 54–69 in *Crises and Perspectives: Studies in Ancient Near Polytheism, Biblical Theology, Palestinian Archaeology and Intertestamental Literature*. Edited by A. S. van der Woude. Oudtestamentische Studiën 24. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Nissinen, Martti. *References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources*. State Archives of Assyria Studies 7. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1998.
- Noll, Kurt L. "Deuteronomistic History or Deuteronomic Debate? (A Thought Experiment)." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (2007) 311–45.
- Noth, Martin. *The Deuteronomistic History*. Translated by Jane Doull, John Barton, Michael D. Rutter, D. R. Ap-Thomas, and David J. A. Clines. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 15. Sheffield, England: JSOT, 1981. Translation of "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk (Dtr)." Pages 1–110 of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. 2d ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1957.
- Nougayrol, Jean. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit. Textes accadiens des archives sud*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1956.
- O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Oded, Bustenay. *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1979.

- . *War, Peace, and Empire: Justifications for War in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1992.
- Olmo Lete, Gregorio del. *Canaanite Religion: According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Bethesda, Md.: CDL, 1999.
- Otto, Eckart. "Die Ursprünge der Bundestheologie im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 3 (1997) 1–84.
- . *Das Deuteronomium. Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 284. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999.
- . "Perspektiven der neuen Deuteronomiumsforschung." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 119 (2007) 310–40.
- . "Deuteronomy between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History: Some Remarks about Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9:17 (2009) 22–27. Online: www.jhsonline.org.
- Parker, Bradley. "Garrisoning the Empire: Aspects of the Construction and Maintenance of Forts on the Assyrian Frontier." *Iraq* 59 (1997) 77–88.
- Parker, Simon B. "Appeals for Military Intervention: Stories from Zinjirli and the Bible." *Biblical Archaeologist* 59 (1996) 213–24.
- , ed. *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Translated by Mark S. Smith. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1997.
- . *Stories in Scripture and Inscriptions: Comparative Studies on Narratives in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions and the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Parpola, Simo. "The Assyrian Tree of Life: Tracing the Origins of Jewish Monotheism and Greek Philosophy." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 52.3 (1993) 161–208.
- . *Assyrian Prophecies*. State Archives of Assyria 9. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1997.
- . "Sons of God: The Ideology of Assyrian Kingship." *Archaeology Odyssey* 2/5 (1999) 16–27.
- . "Monotheism in Ancient Assyria." Pages 165–209 in *One God or Many? Concepts of Divinity in the Ancient World*. Edited by Barbara N. Porter. Transactions of the Casco Bay Assyriological Institute 1. Bethesda, Md.: CDL, 2000.
- . "Assyria's Expansion in the 8th and 7th Centuries and Its Long-Term Repercussions in the West." Pages 99–111 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*. Proceedings of the Centennial Symposium, W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and American Schools

- of Oriental Research, 2000, Jerusalem. Edited by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Parpola, Simo and Kazuko Watanabe, eds. *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. State Archives of Assyria 2. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988.
- Peckham, Brian. "History of Phoenicia." Pages 5:349–57 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "Phoenicians and Aramaeans: The Literary and Epigraphic Evidence." Pages 19–44 in *The World of the Aramaeans II: Studies in History and Archaeology in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion*. Edited by P. M. Michèle Daviau, John W. Wevers, and Michael Weigl. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 325. 3 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Person, Raymond F., Jr. "In Conversation with Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9 (2009) 1–49. Online: www.jhsonline.org.
- Polzin, Robert. *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History: Part One: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges*. New York: Seabury, 1980.
- Pongratz-Leisten, Beate. "The Other and the Enemy in the Mesopotamian Conception of the World." Pages 195–231 in *Mythology and Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences*. Edited by R. M. Whiting. Melammu Symposia II. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2001.
- Porter, Barbara Nevling. *Images, Power, Politics: Figurative Aspects of Esarhaddon's Babylonian Policy*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 208. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1993.
- Postgate, J. N. "The Economic Structure of the Assyrian Empire." Pages 193–221 in *Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires*. Edited by Mogens Trolle Larsen. Mesopotamia 7. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979.
- . "The Land of Assur and the Yoke of Assur." *World Archaeology* 23 (1992) 247–62.
- Pritchard, James Bennett, ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3d ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*. Vol. 1 of *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Rainey, Anson F. *Tell El-Amarna Tablets, 359–379*. Supplement to J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*. 2d ed. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 8. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.
- . "Amarna and Later: Aspects of Social History." Pages 169–87 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and*

Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina. Edited by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Reiner, Erica. "Treaty between Niqmepa of Alalakh and Ir-^dIM of Tunip." Page 531 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3d ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Richter, Sandra. *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: lē-šakkēn šēmō šām in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. New York: De Gruyter, 2002.

Römer, Thomas, ed. *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 147. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000.

———. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*. New York: T & T Clark, 2005.

———. "Response to Richard Nelson, Steven McKenzie, Eckart Otto, and Yairah Amit." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9:17 (2009) 36–49. Online: www.jhsonline.org.

Römer, Thomas and Albert de Pury. "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues." Pages 24–141 in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. Edited by Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 306. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

Rösel, H. N. "Does a Comprehensive "Leitmotiv" Exist in the Deuteronomistic History?" Pages 195–212 in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Thomas Römer. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 147. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2000.

Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Porta Linguarum Orientalium 5. 6th ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995.

———. "Canaanite and Aramaic Inscriptions." Pages 400–504 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3d ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Routledge, Bruce. "The Politics of Mesha: Segmented Identities and State Formation in Iron Age Moab." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 43 (2000) 221–56.

Schloen, J. David. *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001.

Schmitz, Philip C. "Canaan." Page 1:828 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

———. "Phoenician Religion." Pages 5:357–63 in *ibid*.

- Singer, Itamar. "A Political History of Ugarit." Pages 603–733 of *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 39. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Treaties." Pages 2:93–106 in *The Context of Scripture*. 3 vols. Edited by William W. Hallo. New York: Brill 1997–2002.
- Smend, Rudolf. "Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte." Pages 494–509 in *Probleme biblischer Theologie. Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Hans Walter Wolff. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1971.
- . *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*. Theologische Wissenschaft, Bd. 1. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1978.
- Smith, Mark S. "The Baal Cycle." Pages 81–180 in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Edited by Simon B. Parker. Translated by Mark S. Smith. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 9. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1997.
- . *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . *The Rituals and Myths of the Feast of the Goodly Gods of KTU/CAT 1.23: Royal Constructions of Opposition, Intersection, Integration, and Domination*. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 51. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Soden, Wolframs von. *Herrscher im Alten Orient*. Berlin: Springer, 1954.
- Sparks, Kenton L. *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Stager, Lawrence E. "Forging an Identity: The Emergence of Ancient Israel." Pages 90–131 in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Edited by Michael D. Coogan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- . "The Patrimonial Kingdom of Solomon." Pages 63–74 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*. Edited by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Steiner, Margreet. "Jerusalem in the Tenth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.: From Administrative Town to Commercial City." Pages 280–88 in *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan*. Edited by Amihai Mazar. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 331. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Stern, Ephraim. *The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods, 732–332 B.C.E.* Vol. 2 of *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible*. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- . "The Phoenician Source of Palestinian Cults at the End of the Iron Age." Pages 309–22 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan,*

Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina. Edited by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

- Steymans, Hans Ulrich. *Deuteronomium 28 und die adê zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons: Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 145. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
- Streck, Maximilian, ed. *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Ninivehs. 2. Teil: Texte*. Vorderasiatische Bibliothek; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1916.
- Streck, Michael P. "Die Flüche im Sukzessionsvertrag Asarhaddons." *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 4 (1998) 169–91.
- Szemerényi, Oswald. "Vertrag des Hethiterkönigs Tudhaliya IV. mit Išarmuwa von Amurru (KUB 23.1)." *Oriens Antiquus Dissertationes* (1945) 9:113–29.
- Tadmor, Hayim. "Assyria and the West: The Ninth Century and Its Aftermath." Pages 36–48 in *Unity and Diversity*. Edited by Hans Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- . "Treaty and Oath in the Ancient Near East: A Historian's Approach." Pages 127–52 in *Humanizing America's Iconic Book: Society of Biblical Literature Centennial Addresses 1980*. Edited by Gene M. Tucker and Douglas A. Knight. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1982.
- . *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III King of Assyria: Critical Edition, with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994.
- . "Propaganda, Literature, Historiography: Cracking the Code of the Assyrian Royal Inscriptions." Pages 325–28 in *Assyria 1995: Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki, September 7–11, 1995*, Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project. Edited by Simo Parpola and R. M. Whiting. Helsinki: The Project, 1997.
- . "World Dominion: The Expanding Horizon of the Assyrian Empire." Pages 55–62 in *Landscapes: Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East*. Papers Presented to the XLIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Venezia, 7–11 July 1997. Edited by L. Milano et al. Padua: Sargon, 1999.
- Tadmor, Hayim יצחק and Shigeo Yamada. *The Royal Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 BC), and Shalmaneser V (726–722 BC), Kings of Assyria*. The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 1. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Tappy, Ron E., P. Kyle McCarter, Marilyn J. Lundberg, and Bruce Zuckerman. "An Abecedary of the Mid-Tenth Century B.C.E. from the Judaean Shephelah." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 344 (2006) 5–46.
- Taracha, Piotr. "Zur Entwicklung des offiziellen Pantheons im Staats- und dynastischen Kult der hethitischen Grossreichszeit." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 5 (2005) 89–106.

- Toorn, Karel van der. *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life*. Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 7. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Tropper, Josef. *Die Inschriften von Zinjirli*. Abhandlungen zur Literature Alt-Syrien-Palästinas 6. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1993.
- . *Ugaritische Grammatik*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 273. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.
- . *Ugaritisch: Kurzgefasste Grammatik mit Übungstexten und Glossar*. Elementa Linguarum Orientis 1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.
- Tsevat, Matitiah. "Two Old Testament Stories and Their Hittite Analogues." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103 (1983) 321–26.
- Ünal, Ahmet. "Untersuchung zur Terminologie der hethitischen Kriegsführung, I. 'Verbrennen, in Brand Stecken' als Kriegstechnik." *Orientalia* 52 (1983) 164–80.
- . "Studien über das hethitische Kriegswesen, II. Verba Delendi *harnink-lharganu* 'vernichten, zugrunde richten.'" *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 24 (1984) 71–85.
- Van den Hout, Paul J. "Apology of Ḫattušili III (1.77)." Pages 1:199–204 in *The Context of Scripture*. 3 vols. Edited by William W. Hallo. New York: Brill, 1997–2002.
- Van Seters, John. "The Deuteronomist—Historian or Redactor? From Simon to the Present." Pages 359–75 in *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Na'aman*. Edited by Yairah Amit, Ehud Ben Zvi, Israel Finkelstein, and Oded Lipschits. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Veijola, Timo. *Die Ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1975.
- . "Bundestheologische Redaktion im Deuteronomium." Pages 242–76 in *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querbeziehungen*. Edited by Timo Veijola. Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft 62. Helsinki: Finnische Exegetische Gesellschaft; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Vera Chamaza, Galo W. *Die Omnipotenz Aššurs. Entwicklungen in der Aššur Theologie unter den Sargoniden Sargon II, Sanherib, und Asarhaddon*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 295. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.
- . *Die Rolle Moabs in der neuassyrischen Expansionspolitik*. Altes Orient und Altes Testament 321. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2005.
- Vita, Juan-Pablo. "The Society of Ugarit." Pages 455–98 of *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 39. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Walls, Neal H. *The Goddess Anat in Ugaritic Myth*. SBL Dissertation Series 135. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1992.

- Walton, John H. *Ancient Israelite Literature in Its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. Library of Biblical Interpretation. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Regency Reference Library, 1989.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1978.
- Weidner, Ernst. *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien. Die Staatsverträge in akkadischer Sprache aus dem Archiv von Boghazköi*. Boghazköi-Studien 8 and 9. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "בְּרִית *berîth*." Pages 253–79 in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974.
- . "The Common Heritage of Covenantal Traditions in the Ancient World." Pages 175–91 in *I trattati nel mondo antico. Forma, ideologia, funzione*. Edited by Luciano Canfora, Mario Liverani, and Carlo Zaccagnini. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1990.
- . *Deuteronomy I–II*. Anchor Bible 5/1. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- . *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- . "Book of Deuteronomy." Pages 2:168–83 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Weippert, Helga. "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk, Sein Ziel und Ende in der neueren Forschung." *Theologische Rundschau* 50 (1985) 213–49.
- Weippert, Manfred. "'Heiliger Krieg' in Israel und Assyrien: Kritische Anmerkungen zu Gerhard von Rads Konzept des 'Heiligen Krieges im alten Israel.'" *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1972) 460–93.
- . "Assyrische Prophetien der Zeit Asarhaddons und Assurbanipals." Pages 71–115 in *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis*. Edited by Frederick M. Fales. Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente, Centro per le antichità e la storia dell'arte del vicino Oriente, 1981.
- Wesselius, Jan-Wim. "Language Play in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Northwest Semitic Inscriptions: Some Notes on the Kilamuwa Inscription." Pages 253–65 in *The Old Testament in Its World*. Edited by Robert P. Gordon and Johannes C. de Moor. Outtestamentische Studien 52; Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Wiley, Henrietta Lovejoy. "Gather to My Feast: YHWH as Sacrifier in the Biblical Prophets." Ph.D. diss. Harvard University, 2004.
- Winter, Irene J. "On the Problems of Karatepe: The Reliefs and Their Context." *Anatolian Studies* 29 (1979) 115–51.

- . “Art in Empire: The Royal Image and the Visual Dimensions of Assyrian Ideology.” Pages 359–81 in *Assyria 1995: Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki, September 7–11, 1995*. Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project. Edited by Simo Parpola and R. M. Whiting. Helsinki: The Project, 1997.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. “The Kerygma of the Deuteronomic Historical Work.” Pages 83–100 in *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions* by Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff. 2d ed. Atlanta, Ga.: John Knox, 1982.
- Wyatt, Nicolas. *Myths of Power: A Study of Royal Myth and Ideology in Ugaritic and Biblical Tradition*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996.
- . “The Religion of Ugarit.” Pages 529–85 of *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 39. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “The Story of Aqhat (KTU 1.17–19).” Pages 234–58 of *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt. Handbuch der Orientalistik: Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 39. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Yakubovich, I. “Were Hittite Kings Divinely Anointed? A Palaic Invocation to the Sun-god and Its Significance for Hittite Religion.” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 5 (2005) 107–37.
- Younger, K. Lawson, Jr. *Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 98. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.
- . “The Phoenician Inscription of Azatiwada.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43 (1998) 11–48.
- . “The Repopulation of Samaria (2 Kings 17:24, 27–31) in Light of Recent Study.” Pages 254–80 in *The Future of Biblical Archaeology: Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions*. Edited by James K. Hoffmeier and Alan Millard. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2004.

INDEX

- ḥērem*, 12, 25, 29, 31, 41
šōpātīm, 21, 26, 27, 33
ʿēlohīm, 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 17, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45, 56, 85, 108, 111, 218, 219, 222, 225, 226, 228, 229
ʿēlohīm ʿāḥērīm, 8, 40
 1 Kgs, 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35, 76, 192, 196, 229
 1 Sam, 3, 9, 27, 28, 30, 34, 219, 220, 222, 228
 2 Kgs, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 35, 40, 131, 135, 159, 191, 193, 194, 195, 196, 205, 207, 213, 222, 226, 229
 2 Sam, 5, 9, 28, 32, 35, 37, 38, 39, 205, 228, 229
 Aššur, 20, 94, 95, 96, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 173, 176, 178, 183, 184, 185, 187, 193, 194, 197, 198, 201, 202, 207, 208, 209, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 230, 231, 234, 241, 251
 Aššurbanipal, VI, 15, 39, 113, 115, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 169, 197, 199, 203, 207, 214, 217, 219, 221, 225, 227
 Aššurnāširpal II, VI, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 128, 151, 155, 158, 178, 179, 216, 223, 227
 Abou-Assaf, 156, 235
 Ackerman, 58, 59, 235
adê, 77, 137, 143, 146, 150, 153, 169, 173, 185, 195, 214, 237, 249
 Albertz, 15, 196, 235
 Altman, 84, 85, 92, 93, 106, 107, 108, 235
 Amarna, IX, 48, 50, 69, 247
 Amit, 21, 235, 248, 251
 annihilation, 3, 6, 11, 26, 29, 31, 32, 65, 87, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 128, 160, 174, 175, 230
 Aqhat, V, 53, 54, 58, 73, 253
 Aramaean, 127, 153, 155, 157, 164, 166, 214
 archaeological, 49, 76, 164, 191, 192, 196, 203, 204, 205
 Archi, 82, 235
 Arnaud, 50, 235
 Assyrian, VI, IX, 1, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 31, 38, 39, 41, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 62, 63, 71, 72, 87, 90, 94, 95, 96, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 171, 172, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 223, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 245, 246, 247, 249, 250, 252
 Azatiwada, VI, 162, 177, 178, 179, 180, 187, 188, 253
 Ba'lu, V, 49, 52, 54, 55, 56, 60, 66, 67, 68, 73
 Bär, 122, 127, 137, 146, 235
 Barrākib, VI, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187
 Barré, 72, 235
 Beal, 76, 83, 84, 92, 235
 Beckman, 78, 80, 84, 97, 98, 99, 103, 105, 107, 236
 Binger, 55, 67, 236
 Black, 211, 236
 Borger, 116, 138, 141, 143, 147, 148, 221, 224, 227, 228, 236
 Brinkman, 77, 139, 146, 236
 British Museum Collection Database, 236
 Brown, 236, 239
 Bryce, 81, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 97, 98, 236
 Buccellati, 59, 236
 Budge, 115, 236

- Buhl, 58, 70, 236
bureaucracy, 59, 60, 113, 232
Canaan, 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 57, 68, 69, 70, 73, 76, 109, 110, 112, 124, 139, 152, 155, 192, 204, 217, 222, 235, 238, 244, 246, 247, 248, 249
Canaanite, 3, 7, 8, 17, 18, 20, 22, 26, 27, 37, 41, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 65, 66, 68, 70, 73, 74, 77, 111, 159, 164, 165, 169, 171, 181, 189, 190, 191, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 204, 211, 213, 215, 230, 232, 234, 237, 246, 248
Carruba, 89, 236
centralization, 4, 6, 12, 13, 17, 21, 22, 26, 38, 39, 48, 192, 193, 196, 197, 198, 213, 234
Charpin, 236, 238
code, 1, 2, 4, 12, 13, 19, 24, 25, 26, 30, 36, 42, 43, 52, 53, 55, 73, 75, 84, 113, 133, 206, 207, 217, 229, 234
Cogan, 195, 237
Coggin, 16, 237
Cohen, 207, 237
command, 1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 52, 54, 66, 69, 72, 74, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 135, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 162, 163, 169, 172, 178, 179, 180, 183, 184, 186, 187, 190, 196, 197, 199, 200, 208, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 232
conquer, 1, 12, 17, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 72, 108, 111, 113, 115, 121, 122, 125, 135, 151, 153, 162, 169, 180, 186, 205, 216, 230
conquest, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 42, 44, 45, 49, 52, 53, 55, 58, 66, 68, 73, 74, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83, 85, 88, 90, 93, 96, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 119, 121, 122, 124, 125, 129, 131, 132, 135, 141, 143, 146, 150, 151, 153, 154, 159, 163, 165, 169, 170, 171, 175, 192, 193, 195, 197, 199, 205, 206, 207, 215, 218, 222, 223, 225, 230, 232, 234
consecrate, 25, 26, 42, 89
Coogan, 48, 237, 249
covenant, 1, 3, 4, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 62, 63, 66, 68, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 108, 112, 144, 174, 189, 193, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 213, 214, 215, 219, 222, 229, 230, 231, 232, 234
Cross, 8, 9, 11, 20, 29, 37, 41, 54, 60, 61, 65, 67, 68, 72, 195, 205, 237
David, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 28, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 45, 49, 53, 61, 62, 63, 71, 74, 75, 76, 109, 189, 199, 203, 204, 207, 233, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 251
Davies, 17, 31, 237, 242
Day, 66, 237, 239
Dearman, 162, 237
Deut, 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 48, 75, 77, 198, 205, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 217, 218, 219, 226, 228
deuteronomistic, 4, 6, 11, 12, 16, 17, 48, 52, 53, 66, 73, 74, 112, 195, 198, 205, 214, 215, 222, 231, 234
Deuteronomistic History, V, 1, 2, 3, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 25, 31, 38, 205, 207, 235, 239, 240, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248
Deuteronomy, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 75, 76, 77, 195, 198, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, 215, 220, 229, 238, 244, 246, 247, 252
DH, V, VI, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 131, 135, 159, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 201, 202, 205, 206, 207, 212, 213, 214, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 248
Dietrich, 5, 6, 9, 19, 20, 31, 38, 237
Dion, 208, 209, 211, 237, 247

- disobedience, 1, 6, 8, 12, 14, 18, 22, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 43, 46, 54, 68, 69, 74, 107, 115, 116, 125, 141, 142, 144, 152, 154, 173, 216, 218, 220, 221, 222, 230
- Donner, IX, 237
- Dtr₁, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 20, 22, 45, 195, 205, 229
- Dtr₂, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 22, 29, 45, 229
- DtrB, 10, 22
- DtrG, 5, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 19, 22, 31, 36, 49, 193, 196, 197, 198, 200, 229
- DtrL, 11, 12, 22, 31, 229
- DtrN, 5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 22, 36, 45, 229
- DtrP, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 21, 22, 36, 38, 229, 233
- Dubovsky, 136, 137, 162, 208, 237
- Dworkin, 42, 43, 237
- dyadic, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 74
- Egypt, 48, 69, 70, 90, 91, 150, 153, 190
- Egyptian, 49, 50, 90
- Ehelolf, 82, 237
- Eidem, 94, 238
- Esarhaddon, VI, 14, 21, 38, 116, 128, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 149, 152, 199, 202, 207, 208, 210, 212, 213, 219, 221, 224, 227, 236, 238, 247
- exile, 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 29, 30, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 69, 74, 98, 135, 159, 167, 172, 181, 195, 196, 206, 207, 208, 218, 220, 222, 224, 229, 230, 234
- Exile₁, 45, 46, 195, 196, 234
- Exile₂, 45, 46, 234
- Fakhariyah, VI, 155, 158, 159, 161, 165, 180, 185, 186
- Fales, 157, 158, 238, 252
- Finkelstein, 15, 50, 190, 192, 202, 238, 240, 251
- Fitzmyer, 72, 73, 172, 173, 174, 175, 238
- Forrer, 76, 238
- Foster, 179, 238
- Frankena, 212, 238
- Friedrich, 78, 84, 98, 100, 104, 238
- Fuchs, 134, 220, 224, 227, 238
- Galil, 203, 238
- Gallagher, 124, 129, 239
- Genge, 126, 239
- Geoghegan, 17, 233, 239
- Gibson, 68, 159, 166, 177, 239
- god, 1, 6, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 29, 33, 38, 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72, 73, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 93, 96, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 199, 200, 201, 202, 205, 206, 207, 209, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 253
- goddess, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 62, 65, 66, 68, 69, 73, 74, 77, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 101, 104, 105, 106, 109, 145, 148, 149, 150, 152, 191, 221, 225, 228
- Gonnet, 78, 80, 239
- Grayson, IX, 72, 113, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 123, 124, 125, 126, 140, 146, 150, 156, 178, 179, 216, 218, 223, 227, 239
- Green, 177, 239
- Gurney, 15, 76, 202, 239, 240
- Güterbock, 85, 91, 240
- Haas, 80, 240
- Hallo, IX, 159, 235, 240, 241, 248, 251
- Hämeen-Anttila, 233, 240
- Hamilton, 166, 171, 183, 240
- Harvey, VIII, 240
- Held, 240
- Heltzer, 70, 240
- Hezekiah, 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 36, 136, 137, 162, 193, 194, 195, 199, 208, 233, 237
- history, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 30, 33, 42, 44, 46, 48, 71, 73, 76, 77, 80, 84, 90, 96, 112, 125, 154, 162, 187, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 205, 207, 214, 226, 234
- Hittite, VI, 1, 9, 24, 31, 38, 48, 49, 50, 62, 70, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 164, 174, 177, 230, 231, 235, 236, 239, 240, 241, 243, 244, 251, 253

- Hoffmann, 10, 202, 218, 240
Hoffner, 75, 76, 80, 81, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90, 236, 240
Holladay, 189, 241
Holloway, 131, 146, 189, 241
Houwink ten Cate, 78, 82, 83, 87, 88, 90, 93, 241
Huehnergard, 159, 233, 241, 242
hypothesis, 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 19, 22, 23, 30, 45, 46, 50, 73, 203, 211, 212, 231, 232, 234
imperial, 1, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 30, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 49, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 79, 81, 85, 86, 92, 93, 96, 98, 99, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 142, 144, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 159, 160, 161, 163, 165, 166, 167, 169, 171, 172, 174, 175, 178, 180, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 213, 214, 215, 216, 218, 223, 225, 226, 229, 230, 231, 232, 234
Israel, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 44, 45, 50, 57, 61, 62, 124, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 140, 159, 160, 161, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205, 207, 208, 210, 212, 213, 215, 220, 222, 226, 235, 236, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252
Jamieson-Drake, 203, 204, 205, 241
Jepsen, 4, 13, 233, 241
Jeroaboam, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 28, 29, 30, 35, 38, 197
Jerusalem, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 35, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 140, 161, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 212, 213, 214, 215, 226, 229, 230, 231, 234, 238, 241, 243, 244, 245, 246, 249, 250
Jong, 145, 147, 151, 241
Josh, 5, 9, 11, 12, 17, 20, 26, 33, 75, 76, 193, 205, 206, 207, 222, 226, 228
Joshua, 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 15, 18, 20, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 75, 192, 197, 199, 205, 206, 207, 222, 247
Josiah, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 31, 35, 36, 38, 191, 192, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 205, 208, 213, 233, 235, 237
Josianic, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 195, 201, 202, 205, 213
Judah, 6, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 28, 31, 35, 38, 44, 48, 49, 57, 61, 62, 124, 129, 133, 140, 159, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 200, 203, 204, 205, 208, 210, 212, 222, 230, 232, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244
Judg, 2, 26, 27, 33, 68, 205
Judges, 2, 3, 9, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 33, 68, 207, 235, 247
jurisdiction, 12, 42, 46, 93, 116, 122, 132, 135, 152, 153, 159, 163, 167, 169, 170, 181, 184, 186, 187, 223, 224, 225, 226, 230, 232, 234
Keel, VIII, 18, 19, 48, 49, 62, 72, 77, 193, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 231, 241
Kempinski, 76, 241
Kestemont, 101, 103, 241
Kilamuwa, VI, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 181, 186, 187, 188, 252
Kirta, V, 51, 52, 53, 56, 73
Kitchen, 76, 242
Klengel, 80, 81, 84, 93, 106, 107, 242
Kletter, 191, 242
Knauf, 14, 229, 230, 242
Koehler, IX, 242
Kühne, 105, 242
Kuhrt, 50, 81, 88, 155, 242
Lambdin, 233, 242
law, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 29, 30, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 65, 106, 111, 113, 114, 116, 122, 123, 132, 133, 135, 136, 140, 142, 144, 145, 147, 149, 152, 153, 154, 158, 159, 163, 166, 167, 169, 171, 172, 175, 180, 184, 186, 187, 193, 197, 198, 212, 213, 216, 217, 218, 222, 223, 229, 230, 231, 232, 234
Levant, V, VI, 1, 16, 19, 46, 48, 49, 50, 56, 58, 59, 65, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74,

- 76, 77, 96, 112, 113, 155, 159, 176,
186, 215, 226, 231
Liddell, 242
literature, 8, 14, 15, 45, 48, 51, 65, 67, 73,
108, 109, 150, 189, 193, 196, 201,
202, 230
Liverani, 17, 116, 133, 136, 150, 205,
212, 236, 242, 252
Lohfink, 11, 12, 31, 201, 242
Luckenbill, 138, 220, 224, 227, 242
Machinist, 122, 128, 194, 242
Macqueen, 87, 243
Maier, 67, 243
Malbran-Labat, 128, 129, 136, 137, 146,
150, 179, 185, 243
Manasseh, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 193,
195, 197, 222, 226
Margalit, 243
Mati^oel, VI, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 187,
188
matrix, 50, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 73, 205
Mattingly, 162, 240, 243
Mayer, 76, 132, 136, 243
Mayes, 12, 37, 39, 243
Mazar, 189, 192, 196, 243, 249
McCarter, 76, 243, 250
McCarthy, 71, 72, 77, 174, 243
McKenzie, 21, 22, 38, 39, 237, 243, 248
McMahon, 76, 81, 244
Meša', VI, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 186,
188, 231
Melchert, 82, 83, 88, 244
Mendenhall, 38, 46, 75, 76, 77, 174, 244
Meyers, 55, 57, 244
Misgav, 203, 244
Moab, VI, 26, 49, 155, 159, 160, 161,
163, 186, 199, 231, 237, 243, 248
Moran, 39, 174, 244
Morrow, 202, 244
Moses, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 24,
25, 33, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 74, 199,
217, 219, 222, 232, 247
nābî'm, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13,
14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30,
31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44,
45, 46, 73, 108, 193, 196, 198, 199,
200, 201, 202, 216, 219, 222, 229,
232, 233, 234
Na'aman, 15, 50, 124, 134, 136, 140, 190,
191, 192, 193, 202, 203, 205, 212,
244, 245, 251
nābî', 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 21, 24,
27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 42,
43, 44, 52, 53, 108, 232, 233, 241
Nagy, 245
Nelson, 4, 11, 20, 245, 248
Neo-Assyrian, 1, 15, 31, 113, 132, 155,
157, 180, 189, 191, 200, 201, 202,
205, 213, 237, 240, 245, 250, 252
Neu, 86, 87, 245
Nicholson, 245
Nissinen, 144, 145, 146, 150, 169, 217,
225, 237, 245
Noll, 18, 245
Noth, V, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 16, 17, 18,
19, 22, 31, 233, 245
Nougayrol, 98, 245
O'Brien, 13, 14, 245
Ḫattuša, VI, 46, 48, 69, 70, 74, 76, 77, 79,
81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91,
92, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 103, 106, 107,
108, 109, 111, 112, 215, 230
obedience, 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 18, 26,
28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39,
41, 42, 44, 46, 53, 65, 68, 73, 74, 75,
84, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116,
121, 122, 125, 128, 130, 132, 139,
144, 149, 152, 153, 154, 158, 159,
163, 166, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173,
175, 179, 180, 184, 187, 197, 198,
214, 215, 218, 219, 220, 222, 229,
230, 231
Olmo Lete, 53, 56, 59, 246
Otto, 21, 22, 39, 201, 202, 213, 214, 215,
229, 230, 232, 237, 246, 248
Panammuwa, VI, 170, 171, 172, 181,
182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188
Parker, 51, 53, 54, 56, 65, 67, 129, 130,
164, 166, 179, 183, 246, 249
Parpola, 116, 128, 129, 132, 136, 139,
143, 144, 145, 147, 150, 179, 201,
202, 219, 246, 247, 250, 253
patrimonial, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 80,
81, 109, 110, 111, 204, 230
Peckham, 164, 247
Person, 247
Phoenician, 25, 49, 50, 57, 58, 65, 70, 77,
140, 155, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169,
174, 177, 178, 186, 189, 190, 191,
193, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 203,
204, 211, 215, 230, 234, 239, 248,
249, 253
Polzin, 247
Pongratz-Leisten, 247

- Porter, 135, 145, 146, 151, 246, 247
 Postgate, 129, 136, 146, 150, 157, 183, 214, 236, 247
 presuppositions, 1, 2, 22, 24, 42, 46, 68, 75, 77, 108, 189, 193, 197, 216, 225
 Pritchard, IX, 247
 punishment, 2, 3, 6, 8, 12, 22, 30, 34, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 52, 53, 65, 69, 72, 74, 98, 104, 105, 111, 115, 119, 125, 130, 136, 139, 141, 152, 154, 159, 167, 171, 172, 173, 181, 196, 211, 220, 222, 230
 radiance, 114, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 131, 132, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 174, 180, 193, 206, 216, 225, 227, 228
 Rainey, IX, 50, 247
 Reiner, 71, 248
 religion, 6, 7, 45, 46, 50, 52, 56, 57, 59, 61, 67, 73, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 108, 112, 113, 115, 136, 140, 190, 192, 193, 195, 201, 202, 213, 214
 Richter, 207, 248
 Römer, VIII, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 31, 38, 39, 205, 229, 230, 235, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248
 Rösel, 17, 248
 Rosenthal, 164, 181, 233, 248
 Routledge, 163, 242, 248
 Samaria, 4, 7, 8, 13, 16, 20, 21, 29, 31, 35, 44, 45, 131, 134, 135, 136, 189, 190, 192, 194, 195, 196, 212, 234, 253
 Samuel, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 13, 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 36, 38, 75, 219, 220, 222
 Sargon II, VI, 44, 128, 134, 135, 136, 139, 141, 152, 179, 190, 191, 193, 196, 199, 220, 224, 227, 251
 Schloen, 60, 61, 62, 65, 72, 248
 Schmitz, 49, 57, 248
 Sennacherib, VI, 8, 18, 44, 124, 128, 129, 132, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 146, 148, 152, 153, 189, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 198, 199, 206, 207, 213, 214, 220, 224, 227, 236, 239, 242
 servant, 9, 32, 33, 36, 38, 50, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 69, 72, 74, 80, 114, 115, 116, 143, 144, 145, 159, 163, 167, 169, 172, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 184, 185, 187, 197, 201, 210, 214, 217, 219, 220, 221, 224
 Singer, 69, 70, 71, 98, 99, 105, 248
 Smend, 5, 9, 249
 Smith, 53, 54, 55, 56, 65, 67, 194, 246, 249
 Soden, 160, 249
 Solomon, 2, 4, 13, 28, 29, 32, 35, 45, 63, 189, 192, 196, 203, 204, 244, 249
 Sparks, 202, 249
 Stager, 62, 63, 72, 249
 Steiner, 140, 189, 190, 249
 Stern, 58, 134, 136, 140, 191, 192, 196, 212, 249
 Steymans, 208, 209, 210, 212, 229, 249
 Streck, 148, 212, 222, 225, 228, 241, 250
 subjugation, 18, 21, 46, 52, 72, 75, 77, 86, 92, 93, 96, 97, 106, 108, 110, 112, 132, 140, 157, 159, 160, 166, 174, 175, 185, 192, 195, 197, 199, 204, 234
 Szemerényi, 105, 250
 Tadmor, 113, 115, 122, 127, 130, 133, 136, 137, 139, 141, 143, 146, 150, 174, 176, 194, 212, 217, 219, 223, 227, 250
 Tappy, 204, 250
 Taracha, 78, 250
 ten words, 10, 24, 25, 29, 32, 35, 36, 219, 234
 terror, 24, 113, 115, 122, 126, 127, 131, 140, 151, 157, 162, 193, 206, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 234
 Tiglath-pileser III, VI, 8, 44, 45, 71, 113, 114, 115, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 136, 137, 141, 151, 154, 160, 174, 176, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 187, 188, 190, 191, 193, 194, 199, 217, 218, 223, 226, 227, 230, 231, 232, 234, 250
 Toorn, 56, 250
 trade, 41, 48, 49, 50, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 94, 112, 113, 125, 142, 143, 159, 161, 165, 174, 176, 186, 187, 189, 190, 192, 197, 219, 230
 triadic, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 73, 74
 Tropper, 55, 67, 171, 211, 212, 250
 Tsevat, 76, 251
 Ugarit, V, 48, 49, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 80, 92, 97, 98, 101, 103, 111, 155, 164, 174, 175, 236, 240, 241, 244, 245, 246, 248, 250, 251, 253
 Ugaritic, V, 24, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 74, 211, 212, 239, 240, 243, 246, 249, 251, 253
 Ünal, 81, 82, 83, 88, 89, 90, 91, 251

- Van den Hout, 80, 251
Van Seters, 4, 251
vassal, 14, 18, 21, 38, 76, 128, 174, 197,
198, 199, 200, 201, 208
Veijola, 9, 10, 36, 39, 237, 251
Vera Chamaza, 140, 159, 160, 231, 251
Vita, 55, 58, 60, 69, 251
Von Rad, 4, 37, 251
VTE, 21, 38, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213,
229
Walls, 55, 67, 251
Walton, 251
war, 1, 3, 12, 13, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28,
29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39,
42, 45, 49, 67, 75, 80, 82, 83, 86, 88,
89, 90, 93, 102, 104, 108, 109, 110,
113, 114, 115, 136, 141, 146, 147,
149, 150, 153, 154, 167, 169, 179,
186, 191, 194, 215, 216, 217, 223,
225, 226, 230, 231
warfare, 17, 66, 74, 77, 87, 88, 92, 93,
113, 118, 122, 127, 131, 146, 150,
151, 162, 163, 164, 171, 208, 230
Weber, V, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 72, 252
Weidner, 97, 98, 99, 252
Weinfeld, 6, 7, 8, 31, 37, 38, 39, 41, 77,
191, 195, 252
Weippert, 4, 13, 132, 233, 252
Wesselius, 166, 252
Wiley, 25, 252
Winter, 113, 178, 179, 252
Wolff, 12, 242, 249, 253
women, 25, 26, 27, 55, 57, 58, 60, 69,
161
Wyatt, 50, 54, 239, 240, 243, 248, 251,
253
Yakubovich, 86, 253
Younger, 33, 34, 134, 136, 178, 191, 206,
207, 212, 253
Zakkur, VI, 157, 167, 168, 169, 186, 188

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS — Lieferbare Bände / volumes disponibles

- Bd. 199 ADRIAN SCHENKER: *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher*. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher. 224 Seiten. 2004.
- Bd. 200 HILDI KEEL-LEU / BEATRICE TEISSIER: *Die vorderasiatischen Rollsiegel der Sammlungen «Bibel+Orient» der Universität Freiburg Schweiz / The Ancient Near Eastern Cylinder Seals of the Collections «Bible+Orient» of the University of Fribourg*. XXII–412 Seiten, 70 Tafeln. 2004.
- Bd. 201 STEFAN ALKIER / MARKUS WITTE (Hrsg.): *Die Griechen und das antike Israel*. Interdisziplinäre Studien zur Religions- und Kulturgeschichte des Heiligen Landes. VIII–216 Seiten. 2004.
- Bd. 202 ZEINAB SAYED MOHAMED: *Festvorbereitungen*. Die administrativen und ökonomischen Grundlagen altägyptischer Feste. XVI–200 Seiten. 2004.
- Bd. 203 VÉRONIQUE DASEN (éd.): *Naissance et petite enfance dans l'Antiquité*. Actes du colloque de Fribourg, 28 novembre – 1^{er} décembre 2001. 432 pages. 2004.
- Bd. 204 IZAK CORNELIUS: *The Many Faces of the Goddess*. The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddesses Anat, Astarte, Qadesh, and Asherah ca. 1500-1000 BCE. XVI–208 pages, 108 plates. 2004.
- Bd. 205 LUDWIG D. MORENZ: *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen*. Die Herausbildung der Schrift in der hohen Kultur Altägyptens. XXII–390 Seiten. 2004.
- Bd. 206 WALTER DIETRICH (Hrsg.): *David und Saul im Widerstreit – Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit*. Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches. 320 Seiten. 2004.
- Bd. 207 INNOCENT HIMBAZA: *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte*. Etudes des formes textuelles du Décalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament. XIV–376 pages. 2004.
- Bd. 208 CORNELIA ISLER-KERÉNYI: *Civilizing Violence*. Satyrs on 6th Century Greek Vases. XII–132 pages. 2004.
- Bd. 209 BERND U. SCHIPPER: *Die Erzählung des Wenamun*. Ein Literaturwerk im Spannungsfeld von Politik, Geschichte und Religion. Ca. 400 Seiten, 6 Tafeln. 2005.
- Bd. 210 CLAUDIA E. SUTER / CHRISTOPH UEHLINGER (eds.): *Crafts and Images in Contact*. Studies in Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE. XL–375 pages, 50 plates. 2005.
- Bd. 211 ALEXIS LÉONAS: *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*. 360 pages. 2005.
- Bd. 212 BRENT A. STRAWN: *What Is Stronger than a Lion?* Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East. XXX–602 pages, 483 figures. 2005.
- Bd. 213 TALLAY ORNAN: *The Triumph of the Symbol*. Pictorial Representation of Deities in Mesopotamia and the Biblical Image Ban. XXXII–488 pages, 220 figures. 2005.
- Bd. 214 DIETER BÖHLER / INNOCENT HIMBAZA / PHILIPPE HUGO (éds.): *L'Ecrit et l'Esprit*. Etudes d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker. 512 pages. 2005.
- Bd. 215 SÉAMUS O'CONNELL: *From Most Ancient Sources*. The Nature and Text-Critical Use of Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible. XII–188 pages. 2006.
- Bd. 216 ERIKA MEYER-DIETRICH: *Senebi und Selbst*. Personenkonstituenten zur rituellen Wiedergeburt in einem Frauensarg des Mittleren Reiches. XII–412 Seiten, 26 Tafeln. 2006.

- Bd. 217 PHILIPPE HUGO: *Les deux visages d'Élie*. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18. XX–396 pages. 2006.
- Bd. 218 STEFAN ZAWADZKI: *Garments of the Gods*. Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar according to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive. XXIV–264 pages. 2006.
- Bd. 219 CARSTEN KNIGGE: *Das Lob der Schöpfung*. Die Entwicklung ägyptischer Sonnen- und Schöpfungshymnen nach dem Neuen Reich. XII–372 Seiten. 2006.
- Bd. 220 SILVIA SCHROER (ed.): *Images and Gender*. Contributions to the Hermeneutics of Reading Ancient Art. 392 pages, 29 plates. 2006.
- Bd. 221 CHRISTINE STARK: «Kultprostitution» im Alten Testament? Die Qedeschen der Hebräischen Bibel und das Motiv der Hurerei. 262 Seiten. 2006.
- Bd. 222 DAGMAR PRUIN: *Geschichten und Geschichte*. Isebel als literarische und historische Gestalt. XII–424 Seiten. 2006.
- Bd. 223 PIERRE COULANGE: *Dieu, ami des pauvres*. Etude sur la connivence entre le Très-Haut et les petits. 304 pages. 2007.
- Bd. 224 ANDREAS WAGNER (Hrsg.): *Parallelismus membrorum*. 320 Seiten. 2007.
- Bd. 225 CHRISTIAN HERRMANN: *Formen für ägyptische Fayencen aus Qantir II*. Katalog der Sammlung des Franciscan Biblical Museum, Jerusalem, und zweier Privatsammlungen. 176 Seiten. 2007.
- Bd. 226 JENS HEISE: *Erinnern und Gedenken*. Aspekte der biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit. IV–396 Seiten. 2007.
- Bd. 227 HENRIKE FREY-ANTHES: *Unheilsmächte und Schutzgenien, Antiwesen und Grenzgänger*. Vorstellungen von Dämonen im alten Israel. 384 Seiten. 2007.
- Bd. 228 BOB BECKING: *From David to Gedaliab*. The Book of Kings as Story and History. XII–236 pages. 2007.
- Bd. 229 ULRIKE DUBIEL: *Amulette, Siegel und Perlen*. Studien zu Typologie und Tragesitte im Alten und Mittleren Reich. 250 Seiten. 2007.
- Bd. 230 MARIANA GIOVINO: *The Assyrian Sacred Tree*. A History of Interpretations. VIII–314 pages. 2007.
- Bd. 231 PAUL KÜBEL: *Metamorphosen der Paradieserzählung*. X–246 Seiten. 2007.
- Bd. 232 SARIT PAZ: *Drums, Women, and Goddesses*. Drumming and Gender in Iron Age II Israel. XII–156 pages. 2007.
- Bd. 233 INNOCENT HIMBAZA / ADRIAN SCHENKER (éds.): *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible*. Du texte à la théologie au II^e siècle avant J.-C. X–158 pages. 2007.
- Bd. 234 RICARDO TAVARES: *Eine königliche Weisheitslehre?* Exegetische Analyse von Sprüche 28–29 und Vergleich mit den ägyptischen Lehren Merikaras und Amenemhats. XIV–314 Seiten. 2007.
- Bd. 235 MARKUS WITTE / JOHANNES F. DIEHL (Hrsg.): *Israeliten und Phönizier*. Ihre Beziehungen im Spiegel der Archäologie und der Literatur des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt. VIII–304 Seiten. 2008.
- Bd. 236 MARCUS MÜLLER-ROTH: *Das Buch vom Tage*. XII–644 Seiten. 2008.
- Bd. 237 KARIN N. SOWADA: *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom*. XXIV–312 pages, 48 figures, 19 plates. 2009.
- Bd. 238 WOLFGANG KRAUS (Hrsg.) / OLIVIER MUNNICH (éd.): *La Septante en Allemagne et en France / Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie*. XII–316 Seiten. 2009.

- Bd. 239 CATHERINE MITTERMAYER: *Enmerkara und der Herr von Arata*. Ein ungleicher Wettstreit. VI–426 Seiten, XIX Tafeln. 2009.
- Bd. 240 ELIZABETH A. WARAKSA: *Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct*. Context and Ritual Function. XII–252 pages. 2009.
- Bd. 241 DAVID BEN-SHLOMO: *Philistine Iconography. A Wealth of Style and Symbolism*. XII–236 pages. 2010.
- Bd. 242 JOEL M. LEMON: *Yabweb's Winged Form in the Psalms*. Exploring Congruent Iconography and Texts. XIV–244 pages. 2010.
- Bd. 243 AMR EL HAWARY: *Wortschöpfung*. Die Memphitische Theologie und die Siegesstele des Pije – zwei Zeugen kultureller Repräsentation in der 25. Dynastie. XIV–532 Seiten. 2010.
- Bd. 244 STEFAN H. WÄLCHLI: *Gottes Zorn in den Psalmen*. Eine Studie zur Rede vom Zorn Gottes in den Psalmen im Kontext des Alten Testaments. 200 Seiten. 2012.
- Bd. 245 HANS ULRICH STEYMANS (Hrsg.): *Gilgamesch*. Ikonographie eines Helden. Gilgamesh: Epic and Iconography. XII–464 Seiten, davon 102 Seiten Abbildungen. 2010.
- Bd. 246 DONNA LEE PETTER: *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments*. XXVI–208 pages. 2011.
- Bd. 247 ERIKA FISCHER: *Tell el-Far'ab (Süd)*. Ägyptisch-levantinische Beziehungen im späten 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. X–442 Seiten, davon 100 Seiten Abbildungen. 2011.
- Bd. 248 THIERRY PETIT: *Œdipe et le Chérubin*. Les sphinx levantins, cypriotes et grecs comme gardiens d'immortalité. X–390 pages. 90 pages d'illustrations. 2011.
- Bd. 249 WALTER DIETRICH (Hrsg.): *Seitenblicke*. Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch. 472 Seiten. 2011.
- Bd. 250 JEAN-MARIE DURAND / THOMAS RÖMER / MICHAEL LANGLOIS (éds.): *Le jeune héros*. Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien. 376 pages. 2011.
- Bd. 251 MARGARET JAKES (Hrsg.): *Klagetraditionen*. Form und Funktion der Klage in den Kulturen der Antike. 120 Seiten. 2011.
- Bd. 252 MICHAEL LANGLOIS: *Le texte de Josué 10*. Approche philologique, épigraphique et diachronique. 278 pages. 2011.
- Bd. 253 PAUL BÉRÉ: *Le second Serviteur de Yhwh*. Un portrait exégétique de Josué dans le livre éponyme. XVI–284 pages. 2012.
- Bd. 254 GODEFROID BAMBI KILUNGA: *Prééminence de YHWH ou autonomie du prophète*. Étude comparative et critique des confessions de Jérémie dans le texte hébreu massorétique et la «Septante». XVI–224 pages. 2012.
- Bd. 255 MAYER GRUBER / SHMUEL AHITUV / GUNNAR LEHMANN / ZIPORA TALSHIR (eds.): *All the Wisdom of the East*. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren. XXVIII–568 pages. 2012.
- Bd. 256 CATHERINE MITTERMAYER / SABINE ECKLIN (Hrsg.): *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*. mu-ni u₄ ul-li₂-a-aš ḡa₂-ḡa₂-de₃. XVIII–458 Seiten. 2012.
- Bd. 257 JEAN-MARIE DURAND / THOMAS RÖMER / JÜRGEN HUTZLI (éds.): *Les vivants et leurs morts*. X–294 pages. 2012.

ACADEMIC PRESS FRIBOURG
VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT GÖTTINGEN

SONDERBÄNDE / VOLUMES HORS SÉRIE

CATHERINE MITTERMAYER: *Altbabylonische Zeichenliste der sumerisch-literarischen Texte*. XII–292 Seiten. 2006.

SUSANNE BICKEL / RENÉ SCHURTE / SILVIA SCHROER / CHRISTOPH UEHLINGER (eds.): *Bilder als Quellen / Images as Sources*. Studies on ancient Near Eastern artefacts and the Bible inspired by the work of Othmar Keel. XLVI–560 pages. 2007.

Weitere Informationen zur Reihe OBO: www.unifr.ch/dbs/publication_obo.html

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS, SERIES ARCHAEOLOGICA

- Bd. 9 CLAUDE DOUMET: *Sceaux et cylindres orientaux: la collection Chiba*. Préface de Pierre Amiet. 220 pages, 24 pages d'illustrations. 1992.
- Bd. 10 OTHMAR KEEL: *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Einleitung. 376 Seiten mit 603 Abbildungen im Text. 1995.
- Bd. 11 BEATRICE TEISSIER: *Egyptian Iconography on Syro-Palestinian Cylinder Seals of the Middle Bronze Age*. XII–224 pages with numerous illustrations, 5 plates. 1996.
- Bd. 12 ANDRÉ B. WIESE: *Die Anfänge der ägyptischen Stempelsiegel-Amulette*. Eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den «Knopfsiegeln» und verwandten Objekten der 6. bis frühen 12. Dynastie. XXII–366 Seiten mit 1426 Abbildungen. 1996.
- Bd. 13 OTHMAR KEEL: *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band I. Von Tell Abu Farāḡ bis 'Atlit. VIII–808 Seiten mit 375 Phototafeln. 1997.
- Bd. 14 PIERRE AMIET / JACQUES BRIEND / LILIANE COURTOIS / JEAN-BERNARD DUMORTIER: *Tell el Far' ab*. Histoire, glyptique et céramologie. 100 pages. 1996.
- Bd. 15 DONALD M. MATTHEWS: *The Early Glyptic of Tell Brak*. Cylinder Seals of Third Millennium Syria. XIV–312 pages, 59 plates. 1997.
- Bd. 17 OLEG BERLEV / SVETLANA HODJASH: *Catalogue of the Monuments of Ancient Egypt*. From the Museums of the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Bielorussia, Caucasus, Middle Asia and the Baltic States. XIV–336 pages, 208 plates. 1998.
- Bd. 18 ASTRID NUNN: *Der figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordaniens vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* 280 Seiten und 92 Seiten Illustrationen. 2000.
- Bd. 19 ANDREA M. BIGNASCA: *I kernoi circolari in Oriente e in Occidente*. Strumenti di culto e immagini cosmiche. XII–328 Seiten, Tafeln und Karten inbegriffen. 2000.
- Bd. 20 DOMINIQUE BEYER: *Emar IV. Les sceaux. Mission archéologique de Meskéné-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Aštata*. XXII–496 pages, 66 planches. 2001.
- Bd. 21 MARKUS WÄFLER: *Tall al-Hamīdīya 3*. Zur historischen Geographie von Idamaras, zur Zeit der Archive von Mari⁽²⁾ und Šubat-enlil/Šehnā. Mit Beiträgen von Jimmy Brignoni und Henning Paul. 304 Seiten. 14 Karten. 2001.
- Bd. 22 CHRISTIAN HERRMANN: *Die ägyptischen Amulette der Sammlungen BIBEL+ORIENT der Universität Freiburg Schweiz*. X–294 Seiten, davon 126 Bildtafeln inbegriffen. 2003.

- Bd. 23 MARKUS WÄFLER: *Tall al-Ḥamīdīya 4*. Vorbericht 1988–2001. 272 Seiten. 20 Pläne. 2004.
- Bd. 24 CHRISTIAN HERRMANN: *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. Band III. XII–364 Seiten, davon 107 Seiten Bildtafeln. 2006.
- Bd. 25 JÜRG EGGLER / OTHMAR KEEL: *Corpus der Siegel-Amulette aus Jordanien*. Vom Neolithikum bis zur Perserzeit. XVIII–518 Seiten. 2006.
- Bd. 26 OSKAR KÄELIN: *«Modell Ägypten»*. Adoption von Innovationen im Mesopotamien des 3. Jahrtausends v. Chr. 208 Seiten. 2006.
- Bd. 27 DAPHNA BEN-TOR: *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections*. Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period. XII–212 text pages, 228 plates. 2007.
- Bd. 28 JAN-WAALKE MEYER: *Die eisenzeitlichen Stempelsiegel aus dem ʿAmuq-Gebiet*. Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie altorientalischer Siegelbilder. X–662 Seiten. 2008.
- Bd. 29 OTHMAR KEEL: *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel Eton. XIV–642 Seiten, davon 305 mit Fotos und Zeichnungen. 2010.
- Bd. 30 RAZ KLETTER / IRIT ZIFFER / WOLFGANG ZWICKEL: *Yavneh I. The Excavation of the «Temple Hill» Repository Pit and the Cult Stands*. XII–298 pages, 29 colour and 147 black and white plates. 2010.
- Bd. 31 OTHMAR KEEL: *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band III: Von Tell el-Farʿa Nord bis Tell el-Fir. VIII–460 Seiten, davon 214 mit Fotos und Zeichnungen. 2010.
- Bd. 32 KARIN ROHN: *Beschriftete mesopotamische Siegel der Frühdynastischen und der Akkad-Zeit*. 476 Seiten, davon 66 Bildtafeln. 2011.

ACADEMIC PRESS FRIBOURG
VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT GÖTTINGEN

Summary

This study investigates Martin Noth's conclusion about the Deuteronomistic History (DH) that the people of Israel had committed apostasy (*Abfall*), ceased to obey the law code of YHWH, and thus lost their land. Scholars have challenged Noth's hypothesis and even the existence of such a history. The present study adopts a thematic reading of the DH as a coherent corpus of writing with a consistent message. A close reading reveals a god, YHWH, who declares war on other gods (*'ēlōhîm 'ăḥērîm*) and commands his followers to conquer and to sanctify the mountain of the Emorites (*har hā'ēmōrî*; Deut 1:7) and the land of Canaan (*'ereṣ kəna'an*; Deut 32:49) to YHWH. The sanctification includes the killing of the people living there: "When you attack them, you shall annihilate (*haḥărēm taḥărîm*) them entirely. Do not make a treaty with them and do not show mercy to them" (Deut 7:1–2). Throughout the DH, YHWH and his spokespersons, the *nəbî'im*, reward obedience and punish disobedience. Because the disobedient people of Israel fail to enforce YHWH's command to remove the nations of Canaan and their *'ēlōhîm 'ăḥērîm*, YHWH enforces imperial law and sentences them to national death and exile.

This study thus hypothesizes that the DH depicts an imperial, military covenant. After a survey of the inscriptions of the second-millennium B.C.E. Levant, the Hittite empire, the Neo-Assyrian empire, and the first-millennium B.C.E. Levant, the study concludes with a hypothesis that the evidence points to the ideology of the Neo-Assyrian empire as the historical precedent for the Dtr covenant. The study challenges two presuppositions that underlie both the DH and its scholarship: that of the *tôrāh* as law and that of YHWH as a unique god.